

**A COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROFILE OF PROFESSIONAL
AND NON-PROFESSIONAL CRIMINALS IN PAKISTAN**

By

Pervaiz Naeem Tariq

PSY
29

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the

National Institute of Psychology

**Centre of Excellence
Quaid-i-Azam University
Islamabad, Pakistan**

1991

**A COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROFILE OF PROFESSIONAL
AND NON-PROFESSIONAL CRIMINALS IN PAKISTAN**

By

Pervaiz Naeem Tariq

Approved by

Supervisor



Director
National Institute of Psychology

External Examiner

**Dedicated To My Mother
and
My Country**

substitutes to both, I failed to find

CONTENTS

Preface		v
Abstract		vii
CHAPTER 1	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	1
	I) Introduction	1
	II) Typologies of Criminals and Delinquents	8
	III) Offenders Types and Explanations of Criminal Behaviour	21
	IV) Crime Scene in Pakistan and Offender Types	35
CHAPTER 2	PURPOSE, VARIABLES AND HYPOTHESES	41
	I) Purpose and Plan of the Research	41
	II) Variables of the Research	43
	- Classifying Variables	44
	- Folk Concept of Pakistani Professional Criminal	51
	- Demographic Variables	52
	- Early Home Environmental Conditions	59
	- Personality Characteristics	63
CHAPTER 3	METHOD	81
	Samples	81
	Instruments	83
	Procedures	90
CHAPTER 4	FINDINGS	95
	I) A Folk Concept of a Professional Criminal	95
	II) Classification into Professional and Non-Professional Criminals	100
	III) A Comparative Social-Psychological Profile	123
	- Demographic Variables	123
	- Early Home Environmental Conditions	136
	- Personality Characteristics	141
CHAPTER 5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	149
REFERENCES		179
ANNEXURES		197

PREFACE

The initial aspirations regarding this research, most admittedly, were to develop a typology of criminals for the purpose of explicating personality differences between committers of different criminal acts. The inspiration came from tentative clues found in an earlier work (Tariq & Durrani, 1983) that personality characteristics as well as the background circumstances of murderers in Pakistan, at one hand, and the property offenders, on the other, looked different. It also seemed that important differences might exist even among the committers of one type of criminal act as, murderers who assault, hurt and kill in interpersonal situations and those who commit the same act while committing robbery and other property offenses looked very different from each other. This realization gave impetus to the undertaking of the present work and a development of a typology of Pakistani Criminals was set as the research goal. However, it was soon realized that the task was formidable and the heterogeneity which existed in criminal behaviour, and the frequent crime switching observed among criminals would not allow the formulation of any typology of criminals.

Despite this discouraging position, an empirically derived classification scheme having some heuristic value has been suggested on the basis of the present research work. It is contended that these types of classification schemes or descriptions of different types of criminals are still required for the same reasons for which the typological efforts once commenced, (and now seem to have waned if not abandoned in despair) namely etiological understanding of criminal behaviour and effective handling of criminals specially the prisoners. The present research is the first of its type in this country. Only further research would determine its validity as it relates to criminological issues like explanation of criminal behaviour and correctional efforts in the prisons.

The completion of this work owes a great deal to Dr. Z. A. Ansari, director National Institute of Psychology. He encouraged the author to work on this research problem despite many difficulties which came in its way. As the supervisor of this research, his patience while he saw the work passing through various stages has been remarkable and the author feels greatly indebted to him.

The author is obliged to note the very helpful suggestions made by Dr. Zahid Mehmood of Glasgow and Dr. Ashiq Ali Shah of National Institute of

Psychology at initial phases of the work. The author's grateful thanks are also due to Professor Don C. Gibbons of Portland State University in America. Dr. Gibbons himself has spent more than quarter of a century working on typology of criminals and author's correspondence with him proved to be most educating and enlightening.

Grateful acknowledgements also must be given to Samina Ashfaq who extended valuable help in scoring some protocols as the 'second judge'. Salma Siddiqui read the manuscript quite critically and gave valuable suggestions to improve it for which I am greatly indebted to her. Thanks are also due to Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali who typed the manuscript for innumerable times without any hesitation.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to Itrat Abass who helped in data collection. I am also thankful to the Interior Ministry, Government of Pakistan, Police Research and Development Bureau, Inspectors General of Prisons and the relevant prison authorities for their cooperation in data collection. Above all, I am indebted to the subjects of this study whose willing cooperation made this study possible.

My father's desire for my growth and elder brother's wishes for my success have always been inspirational for me to work for the attainment of such achievements.

The understanding and forbearance of Shahida, Muznah, Nomair, Aniqah and Maliha are gratefully acknowledged as the time devoted to this work could have been spent in a mutually blissful way with them.

P.N.T.

ABSTRACT

Criminal behaviour, being heterogeneous collection of activities, is often argued to be classified into more homogeneous units. As important differences exist among such kinds of criminals as violent killers, obsessive rapists, professional thieves, white-collar offenders and prostitutes, classification of offender patterns are required if progress is to be made towards the discovery of causal factors or/and effective handling and rehabilitation of prisoners. Previous researchers have demonstrated the existence of offender types by pointing to similarities among offenders. However, the empirical tests of offenders typologies have been rare and a few studies done so far indicate that there is usually a disagreement found between typological claims and empirical observations. But despite the difficulties encountered in the development of typologies of criminals, studying them in types is important for psychologists whose interests revolve around and persist in the etiology of criminal behaviour. It is also important as studying crime and delinquency in general and exploring some global theories which could explain all criminality seems futile simply because of the tremendous amount of heterogeneity found in criminal behaviour. In the present research, two samples of convicts, one randomly chosen ($N= 240$) and the other selected through stratified random sampling ($N= 140$) from Pakistani prisons are classified in two broad categories, namely Professional and Non-professional Criminals. These two types are not obtained from any theoretically constructed typology. Neither do these preclude other types. Rather, these are empirically derived types differing on certain defined attributes called Classifying Variables such as Type of Crime, Past Criminal Record, Relationship with the Victim, Premeditation, and Criminal Associations. These variables are offense-related and not offense-specific. These are operationally definable. On these variables is also based the folk concept of a Professional Criminal in the Pakistani society. This concept was tapped in the present research by having responses of 151 subjects belonging to representatives of general public and law-enforcement agencies on 23 questions constructed in such a way that each described a Professional Criminal in relation to one or the other Classifying Variable. The findings indicated that there was a high concurrence between the researcher's conceptualization of a Professional Criminal and that of the lay public.

The data on prisoners regarding Classifying Variables, Demographic Variables and Early Home Environmental Conditions were collected with the help of interview-guide. In-depth interview was held with each subject. Data on Personality Characteristics, namely Socialization, Self-esteem and Acting-out (Aggressive) behaviour were obtained by administering three personality tests

which are Socialization Scale of California Personality Inventory, Urdu Adjective Check-list and the Hand Test. The findings indicate that most Pakistani prisoners are classifiable into the two suggested categories of Professional and Non-professional Criminals on the basis of defined Classifying Variables. Though the variables did not classify the subjects in one particular direction of Professional or Non-professionalness as a subject considered Professional on one variable was not necessarily judged Professional on another variable, yet high correlations were found as regards the judgement of subjects on the classifying variables, which suggested that if a subject was judged as "Professional" on one classifying variable, he was likely to be judged so on another variable too. Type of Crime and Past Criminal Record were two variables which showed the highest correlation. Findings also indicate that Professional and Non-professional Criminals significantly differed from each other on all the Classifying Variables. Four hypotheses related to Demographic Variables were supported by the findings which meant that compared with Non-professional Criminals, Professional Criminals (a) had committed their crimes more frequently in urban localities, (b) had lesser mean age, (c) were more frequently unmarried at the time of commission of their first offence and (d) more frequently reported having had a chequered Occupational Life Pattern. No significant differences, however, were observed between the two types on variables of educational level and socio-economic status. As regards the Early Home environmental Conditions, all the four hypotheses were supported by the findings which meant that Professionals, compared with Non-professionals, (a) belonged more frequently to Physically Broken Homes, (b) belonged more frequently to Psychologically Disrupted Homes, (c) reported more frequently having received Defective Modes of Discipline from their parents, and (d) scored higher on the Psychological Adversity Scale. As regards the personality characteristics, two of the three hypotheses were supported by the findings which meant that Professional Criminals, compared with Non-professional criminals, scored significantly lower on both Socialization and Self-esteem scales. However, there was not found any significant difference between Professional and Non-professional Criminals on the variable of "Acting-out" (Aggressive) behaviour.

Etiological importance of the classification has been highlighted. Implications for further research have been discussed and suggestions for effective handling of convicted prisoners have been given on the basis of the research findings.

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

I-INTRODUCTION

Crime is a serious social problem in almost every society of the world. Much scientific investigation has been directed towards its explanation along with efforts aimed at its effective prevention and control. Discovery of the causes of crime (and juvenile delinquency) has been one of the main interests of social scientists like criminologists, sociologists, and social psychologists. Their major aim has been to develop a body of generalizations or propositions accounting for criminality. However, the heterogeneity found in criminal behaviour makes the task of the social scientists quite difficult. Criminality is a broad rubric containing under it a very large number of behavioural forms having little in common with each other. This renders it somewhat doubtful if a general theory of criminal etiology can be discovered which will explain all the disparate forms of behaviour considered "criminal". Sutherland and Cressey (1955) who tried to evolve a general theory of crime at times realized this as they observed:

It is not likely that a general explanation of all crimes will be sufficiently specific or precise to aid greatly in understanding or controlling crime. In order to make progress in the explanation of crime, it is desirable to break crime into more homogeneous units (p.548).

The growing difficulty which researchers faced in explaining the diverse forms of acts with any one general theory resulted in a proliferation of typologies of criminal behaviour. For more than half a century almost every sociologist or social-

psychologist interested in criminal behaviour tried to explain it with some sort of typification (Gibbs, 1960).

In fact, the process of classification is not to be found among scientists alone and the need of evolving typologies is not unique to criminology. In every day life, one of the basic and most salient cognitive features involved in social or person perception is sorting people and social phenomena into categories and then assigning labels to them (see, for example, Bruner, 1980; Shantz, 1975). Schneider, Hastorf, and Ellsworth (1979) observe:

Just as we create structure in inanimate world by categorizing stimuli into objects and their attributes, so we create order in the world of people by categorizing them and their behaviour (p. 10).

People are categorized often into types according to their temperaments, habits and behavioural attitudes, adjudged in a specific social context. In a scientific process, classification or typification is a methodological approach which is quite widely used in almost all science disciplines. By this method, regular or recurrent patterns of behaviour (both animate and inanimate) are identified and grouped together so that theoretical systems are developed which adequately explain that behaviour. These "types" which are abstracted from phenomena are usually called ideal types or constructed ones (see, for example, McKinney, 1966). These types serve well the purpose of description, comparison and prediction of the behaviour, as well as contribute to the development of theory which help explain that behaviour. The types which are adequately explained by a theoretical system in an interrelated manner are conceived to be parts of a typology. A well constructed typology should stand the test of empirical verification because that is the point where typologies differ from classification schemes. Gibbons (1985) observes:

Typologies differ from classification schemes in that they make truth claims, that is, they assert that only a certain number of the logically possible classes of phenomena to which the typology is directed exist in the real world. For example, in an offender typology based upon offense behaviour, intelligence and socio-economic status of law-breakers, one logically possible pattern might be that of an embezzler of low intelligence from a lower-income background, but that type might be excluded from the typology because it is assumed to occur rarely if ever among actual offenders (P. 157).

The need for offenders' typology and classification schemes has been felt perhaps also because of the failure of legal definitions and classifications of criminal behaviour to help criminologists towards etiological explanations (Lindesmith & Dunham, 1956). In law, the body of 'conduct definitions' and penalties for their violation contain several systems of classification. One of these is the sorting of offenders into felonies and misdemeanours. The former are crimes thought to be most serious or heinous, and carry penalties of long imprisonment or death. Misdemeanours, on the other hand, are regarded as relatively petty acts of lesser significance. They are punished by short jail terms or fines. However, there are a lot of variations across different societies between the two types of crimes, particularly in terms of penalties given to their committers. Behaviour which is misdemeanour in one society is felony in another. In certain extreme cases, the act which is criminal in one society may not be so in another culture, it may even be a perfectly acceptable and even socially desirable conduct there. Consumption of alcohol is one behaviour in point and there are many sex-related acts which show much divergent forms of legal and social acceptability in Pakistani and the Western society. Therefore, statistical data on criminal behaviour, research studies and other reports on criminality commonly employing legal felony-misdemeanour distinctions or specific offense

labels (murder, rape, drinking alcohol, theft, etc.) for purpose of classifying offenses or offenders seem to have no great significance.

Legal labels are inadequate as a basis for etiological classification of crimes or criminals for several other reasons also. The legal definitions reveal nothing about such important elements of criminal acts as offender-victim relationships or the social context of the deviant act, which are probably of considerable importance in understanding the etiology of different patterns of criminality.

Moreover, legal offense labels are deficient as the basis for classification in another important way too. Criminal who is classified at one point in time as "assaultist" does not engage only in that single offense. An individual who murdered someone, may become a smuggler or a robber later in life. Similarly, the legal tag attached to an offender at the terminal end of the legal operation, after he has been processed through a court, is frequently a label different from the one initially assigned to the offender at the stage of apprehension. A person originally charged for murder may be finally pleaded guilty of a charge of abetment in murder. Thus "murderous" nature or the intent behind his act or the personality disposing the individual to that type of an act would be difficult to assess.

Thus, the legal labels and classifications, etc. could be accurate and even may be serving some good purpose as far as the legal process of prosecution, etc. is concerned. However, these are eschewed as the basis for etiological explanation of crime. Instead, it has been realized that a classification scheme can show promise only when it cuts across legal labels and combines several specific legally defined offenses into a single category, and which could also have some theoretical significance.

The typological approach in criminology is close to the lay man's perception of criminals. A common man does perceive, though intuitively, important differences

between criminals such as, murderers, rapists, burglars, white-collar criminals and petty thieves and that the layman's understanding of crime and its causation seems to be affected by perception of the offender and type of offense (see, for example, Gibbons & Jones, 1975; Gudjonsson, 1984; Hollin & Howells 1987). Similarly criminologists, somewhat more explicitly and with theoretical sophistications, argue that a number of distinct types of criminal acts and offenders exist and can be identified and studied. Most of the previous researchers have demonstrated the existence of types by pointing to similarities among offenders of a particular form of criminal act as well as differences which seem to exist among such kinds of criminals as violent killers, obsessive rapists, professional thieves, white collar offenders, and prostitutes.

We will see shortly that the efforts to develop typologies of criminals have not yielded any fruitful results in terms of giving sound typological formulations of criminal behaviour. However, despite the difficulties encountered in the task of developing typologies of criminals and delinquents, the criminologists, specially the psychologists-criminologists, would perhaps keep on feeling the need for certain classification schemes having at least some heuristic value for a number of reasons, two of these being the most important. Firstly, identifying types among offenders is needed for etiological explanations as one single global theory cannot explain the diversity found in the criminal behaviour. Crime being a heterogeneous collection of activities, it should be broken down into more homogeneous units because typologies or classification of offender patterns and types are required for progress towards the discovery of causal factors. Secondly, effective handling, treatment and rehabilitation of offenders are more likely if "different strokes" are used for "different folks". Therefore, it is only on the basis of identification of different criminal types, each having a different causal process, that differential legal treatments, intervention techniques and rehabilitative measures can possibly be evolved.

The purpose of the present research is to empirically derive a classification scheme of criminals in the Pakistani context. Two such types have been identified and labelled as Professional and Non-professional criminals with very specific meanings attached to both. The Professional in the present research means a criminal who usually commits property offenses somewhat repeatedly and exhibits generally a "criminal way of life". The conceptualization of a Professional criminal and how it could be differentiated from a Non-professional criminal has been described in details. It has been also shown that certain offense-related variables can help identify and discriminate Professional from the Non-professional. Then it has been demonstrated that these variables are the same on which the layman's conceptualization of a Professional criminal in the Pakistani context is based. The classification is shown to be empirically verifiable and is envisaged to have theoretical significance and psychological meaningfulness. It has implication for effective handling and rehabilitation of inmates in the prisons, particularly in the Pakistani context. It may be mentioned that many efforts are directed towards correction, rehabilitation, and social-psychological welfare of the prison inmates in the developed countries of the world. However, the legal processes in Pakistan are totally devoid of any considerations of social-psychological nature. It is envisaged that the differential considerations of types of criminals as formulated in the present study would be quite useful if applied in the legal and penal processes, correctional settings and prison set-ups. These may contribute to a marked development in the not-very-desirable conditions prevailing in these institutions, and some redeeming features in the sufferings of Pakistani prison inmates may become possible.

In the pages to follow, a brief resume of typologies of criminals and delinquents has been given followed by a general appraisal of these typologies. In the next chapter, the present research problem has been formulated describing the specific aims and objectives of the study. The rationale, descriptions and operational definitions of the variables studied in the present research are also given in that chapter. Chapter 3

describes the methodology employed to meet the objectives of the study. This includes descriptions of samples, instruments and procedures of the study. Chapter 4 contains the findings of study presenting a comparative social-psychological profile of the Professional and Non-Professional criminals. In Chapter 5, the findings of the present research are discussed and practical implications are also pointed out.

II-TYOLOGIES OF CRIMINALS AND DELINQUENTS

The view regarding the existence of types of criminals has been there in literature even in the nineteenth century (see, for example, Low, 1982; Tobias, 1967). In the early twentieth century too, the view continued to persist. In fact, the scientific inquiry into criminality is considered to have begun with the typological efforts by the Italian criminologist, Lombroso (cited in Gibbons, 1987) who has often been identified as the father of modern criminology. He had contended that there were three types of criminals: born criminals, insane criminals, and criminaloids; the last group consisting of those persons who were "normal" physically and psychologically but happened to commit crimes because of stressful interpersonal situations and other life circumstances.

Since Lombroso, the developing of typologies and classification schemes has had much importance in sociological, biological, psychiatric, psychological and social-psychological approaches to the study of criminal behaviour (McKenna, 1972). The twentieth century typological efforts, particularly in the United States, have been made mainly by sociologists (Gibbons, 1979). This body of work can be categorized in three or four distinct groups. First, some sociologists have intensively studied one single type of crime or criminal. This approach could be called a crime-centered approach focused upon specific forms of criminal acts such as burglary, car thefts, organizational crime, or political crime, etc. The main objective of criminological analysis in this kind of work has been to study differences among various forms of criminality, including information on the correlates of these patterns such as the social areas in which they are committed, temporal variations in their occurrence, and many other related facts. The typologies of the specific forms of criminal behaviour developed by criminologists of sociological and social-psychological orientations are many but some outstanding examples of these investigation are the

inquiry on homicide by Wolfgang (1958), on burglary patterns by Scarr, Pinsky, and Wyatt (1973), on check forgers by Lemert (1953, 1958), and on the broad category of property offenders by Tappan (1960) and Reckless (1967).

However, the main thrust of typological work has been "person-centred" or "criminal centered", in which efforts were made to identify varieties of criminal or delinquent persons. With this approach, some researchers have studied prison inmates and described social roles they are alleged to play, peculiarities of their characters, attitudes and experiences and the way they are perceived and addressed by each other. The researches of Giallombardo (1966), Heffernan (1972), Schrag (1961b) and Sykes (1958) are the examples of such efforts (for brief reviews see Gibbons, 1985, 1988, and McKenna, 1972). The offender types identified by these researchers allegedly manifest specific "social roles" inside the prison set-up. They have been described as having peculiar characteristics of behaviour, attitudes, and the way they are perceived by other inmates. These types have been identified among prison population and have been sometimes invoked as support for typological arguments about offenders at large, on the assumption that they indicate the existence of behaviour patterns among offenders.

However, the bulk of evidence on social roles types among prison population does not support the existence of any types of personalities and behaviours, or groupings of background characteristics among inmates (see, for example, Garabedian, 1964; Leger, 1979; Poole, Regoli, & Thomas, 1980). No doubt, these typological descriptions, at times, do highlight some behaviour patterns and attitudes that are observable among a few inmates, but the fact remains that prisoners do not behave consistently in the manner described by these inmate social role typologies. Neither do these descriptions tally with the social roles or behavioural types among the criminals of the world outside of prisons.

Elaborate listings of types of offenders have been also attempted. Three of the most well known, comprehensive and general typologies are developed by Clinard and Quinney (1973), Glaser (1972, 1975) and Gibbons (1965). These are called "constructed types" (Gibbons, 1985, p. 156), being invented mainly by sociologists as their conceptual aid (for a comprehensive review of such typologies, see Gibbons & Krohn, 1986). There are other ways too in which the criminal typologies have been classified. McKenna (1972) has given a review of different typologies under following classifications: general typologies (e.g., Bloch & Geis, 1962; Cavan, 1962; Clinard, 1968; Lindesmith & Dunham, 1956; Morris, 1965), typologies of specific forms of criminal behaviour (e.g., Tappan, 1960; Wolfgang, 1958), empirical typologies (e.g., Gillin, 1946; Hayner, 1961; Roebuck, 1967; Schrag, 1961b) and diagnostic typologies (e.g., Gibbons, 1968).

Psychologists and psychiatrists' efforts in classification of criminals have been motivated mainly because of their interests in exploring causes of human behaviour within individual's personality. They seem to be interested in finding those personality differences which may discriminate between offenders and non-offenders, so that they could address to the basic question about law-violators: How the criminal behaviour is acquired and how does it become a predominant way of behaving among some of them.

Most of the typological work in criminology in America was done by sociologists (Gibbons, 1985) and psychologists' and psychiatrists' contributions in development of classifications of adult offenders have been scant. One of the earliest efforts of psychologists to sort offenders into types is the assortment of criminals into seven categories by Corsini (1949). These groupings of offenders included irresponsible, neurotic, psychotic, and psychopathic criminals. Guttmacher (1960), a psychiatrist by profession, suggested that some criminals are normal and the others abnormal. Among abnormal he identified sociopaths, alcoholics, schizophrenics,

and temporarily psychotics. Neustatter (1957) propounded a psychiatric typology of murderers.

However, it seems that where sociologists were predominantly interested in developing typologies of adult criminals, psychologists concentrated more on discovering patterns and types of anti-social behaviour and other behavioural problems among children and adolescents. For example, with the exceptions of researchers like Gibbons (1965) who delineated nine juvenile offender types, and Cohen and Short (1958) who described "delinquent subcultures", sociologists do not seem to have offered any worth mentioning juvenile offenders' typologies. Psychologists, on the other hand, have developed many typologies of youthful offenders. Atwood, Gold, and Taylor, (1989) in a recent article observe:

The search for a psychologically meaningful set of types for distinguishing delinquent youths has been going on for about 40 years, in the hope of advancing etiological theory and improving treatment (p.68).

Reviews have appeared which document the literature on typological efforts regarding the delinquents (see, for example, Gold & Petronio, 1980 and Quay, 1987). Some other work on typologies of delinquents has been carried out by Atwood et al. (1989), Cohen and Short (1958), Gold and Mann (1984), Hewitt and Jenkins (1946), Loeber (1982), Megargee, Bohn, Meyer, and Sink (1979), Quay and Parsons (1972), Warren (1976), and West and Farrington (1973, 1977). Gibbons (1988), however, has criticized all psychologically oriented typologies as an outcome of interest in treatment of offenders, and to him these cannot qualify as offender typologies. Moreover, recent research shows that among real life offenders there is hardly ever found single-crime specialists though offenders can be sorted out according to the seriousness of crimes committed and the frequency with which they commit crimes (see, for example, Dunford and Elliott, 1984; Klein, 1984; Lab 1984).

General Appraisal of Typological Work

We have seen that a large number of researchers have remained involved in evolving different typologies of criminals. They have been interested in investigating certain recurrent features of behaviour among different law breakers. Theoretical and conceptual issues in such investigations have been pertaining to questions like how are law violators to be sorted out? How are etiological variables to be organized and brought to bear upon the study of different types of criminals. However, most of the previous research efforts have been replete with methodological problems and hence have not met much success. Gibbons (1968) observes:

Most assertions that criminality is not homogeneous, but that particular patterns of uniform behaviour can be observed are followed by vague, incomplete, anecdotal, and logically ambiguous classification systems. Commonly, someone advances the argument that there are types of offenders, and proceeds to list types like egocentric, wayward offender, professional criminal or gang delinquent within which offenders are held to fall. These categories are not well defined, and are often illustrated by case histories rather than explicit statements of definitional attributes of the types. It is difficult to visualize research tests of such claims, for it is unlikely that different researchers would classify particular offenders in the same way or within the same types (p.218).

An evaluation of the existing typological schemes may not lead to any encouraging results. One readily discovers that typological efforts in criminology have not produced cumulative results and hence there is no straight line of development from the earliest efforts to the present ones. In fact, few offender typologies meet the criteria for a sound criminal typology that have been described in literature both by the formulators as well as the critics of the typologies (Driver, 1968,

Gibbons, 1965, Schrag, 1961b, Schafer, 1969). The criteria which have been usually set before themselves by various criminologists (e.g. Gibbons, 1985, p.157-158) are as follows:

1. Typologies must be relatively clear and explicit and the defining attributes of particular offender or offense types must be specified in detail so that persons or events can be assigned to them in a consistent and reliable fashion, and a given typology is amenable to empirical verification.
2. Typologies should be made up of mutually exclusive types or categories so that actual offenders or crime events fall into only one of the types of the typological system.
3. The criterion of parsimony should be followed which means that the number of the types in the scheme should be relatively limited. An offender or offense pattern categorization that yields scores of offender types would be too unwieldy to be of much use to criminologists. However, it should also be comprehensive enough to include most, if not all, criminal behaviour.
4. Another criterion is that of "empirical congruence" which requires that a typology has a reasonable degree of "isomorphism with reality". It simply requires that the criminal acts and offender incumbents placed in various categories of a typology should stand the test of empirical verification as and when it is applied.

Reviewing various typological efforts, one realizes that despite the much efforts directed towards outlining and formulating typologies of all statures and kinds, little efforts were made to put them to empirical testing (Hartjen & Gibbons, 1969; McKenna, 1972). The importance of empirical verification can hardly be overargued and the lack

of empirical evidence of typological work has been lamented a great deal by many. For example, Schrag (1961a) says that "...Theories that are not supported by empirical evidence may be little more than wishful thinking" (p.309). Caldwell (1965) comments that "--few empirical studies have been made to determine the differences between offender types" (p.101). In fact, most typological formulations seem to be lacking in specific definitional attributes which could make possible the empirical verification of a typology.

Even the typologies which are based on observations of prisoners and are extracted from data on offenders, seem to have met only partial success when these were subjected to empirical verification. No doubt, these typological efforts can not be brushed aside as utterly useless or meaningless as these do have some heuristic value. However, the greatest flaw that most empirically derived typologies seem to have is that these are not structured in some theoretical context. In fact, most of the typologies formulated so far (with exceptions of Gibbon's (1965, 1968), and to some extent, Glaser's (1972) and Clinard & Quinney's (1973) works have been lacking in an overall theoretical framework in which the formulated typologies could have been explained. It seems that most researchers have given only narrowly defined types to suit to some current research purposes and thus their descriptions of offender types have largely remained unguided by any kind of broad organizing theory. The result is that there are as many typologies as there have been propounders of those typologies. Lack of theoretical context has resulted in most typologies simply failing to explain the etiological relationships of specific types as much as being unable to provide any useful application in legal and penological processes and rehabilitative or correctional settings. Both Gibbons (1965, pp. 26-27, 40) and Schrag (1961a, pp.309-357) emphasize this need. Schafer (1969) views this as being an essential requirement of a typology when he says:

A criminal typology remains a meaningless speculation if it is not linked to a theoretical model and if it has no penal or correctional application (p. 143).

McKenna (1972) observes:

Although many sociologically or social-psychologically constructed criminal typologies present etiological relationships to some degree, rarely do they offer any correctional applications (p.5).

The problems facing typological efforts including the failure to provide evidence which could satisfy the standard criteria of typology have led researchers like Gibbons (personal communication, December, 1989) to conclude that many real life offenders cannot be classified with much precision into categories of any typology. Main reasons for this conclusion remain the variety and heterogeneity observed in criminal behaviour and crime switching found among criminals (see, for example, Chaiken & Chaiken, 1982; Petersilia, Greenwood & Lavin, 1977; Peterson, Braiker & Polich, 1980). The findings on these and similar studies make us realize that if crime switching among offenders is so common, then a typological assignment at a given time will be quite unstable in many cases such that individual who is classified as drug dealer in a study this year may turn out to be a burglar or a violent predator when next encountered by the researcher or the law-enforcing agencies. Obviously, this makes the long-term value of the typological approach doubtful. Moreover, involvement in law-breaking arises out of circumstances so numerous and varied that clear-cut etiological processes cannot easily be identified.

Gibbons (1985) seems to have given up the idea of developing a typology of criminal acts as he observes:

The typological idea is a fairly simple and straight forward one that has superficial plausibility but it is also an idea whose time has probably gone. Many of the typological systems that have been suggested by criminologists... are fuzzy and ambiguous, making it difficult if not impossible to scrutinize them through research efforts (p.171).

About his own typological work, Gibbons (1985) says:

I have devoted about a quarter of a century to work of one kind or another on offender typologies. ... But the research evidence... indicates that I have been engaged in a relatively fruitless endeavour, as have other architects of comprehensive typologies (p. 170).

In a personal communication Gibbons (personal communication December, 1989) has not hesitated to advise that the idea of developing a typology of criminals should be given up.

The initial aspirations and subsequent dismal results in typological efforts in criminology, thus, may lead one to a justified conclusion that the typologies meeting criteria like the one proposed by Gibbons and others do not seem plausible considering the heterogeneity of criminal behaviour and other allied factors discussed above. In the sociological context, Gibbons (1985) may sound right when he gives a piece of advice to the sociologist-criminologist to abandon the typological efforts and instead give more attention to queries about crime patterns, crime rates and the social-structural conditions that are predictive of crime in aggregate. However, studying empirically derived offenders types, no matter how limited purposes they serve, were considered valuable on the past (see, for example, Hayner, 1961) and continues to have value at present (see, for example, Gibbons, 1985) for psychologists and those whose interests persist in etiological understanding of

criminal behaviour. Hayner (1961) after having demonstrated existence of types in his data observes:

Valid generalizations about all criminals or even a substantial proportion are difficult to make. Selected offender types, however, such as those studied in this project, show distinctive personality traits, family and community backgrounds and roles played in prison. In brief, if attention is given to specific kinds of offenders, significant generalizations are possible (p. 102).

Despite viewing the typological accounts of crime patterns or types of criminals as efforts in futility, Gibbons (1985) acknowledges their importance in etiological explanations of criminal behaviour as he observes:

The typological perspective has played a part in this search for answers as to why specific individuals engage in acts of law breaking (p. 172).

However, he suggests to social scientist to pay less attention to the etiological understanding of criminal behaviour, and instead recommends direction of efforts towards study of sociological aspects. He observes:

Criminologists have been unduly concerned about the etiology of individual acts of law breaking and have not given sufficient attention to queries about crime patterns that are predictive of crime in the aggregate (p. 172).

Nevertheless, he does not deny the heuristic value of classification schemes and their usefulness in the effective handling of the offenders as he observes:

Classifications and typologies of offenders will probably also continue to show up in correctional settings, particularly now that modern computer technology provides researchers and administrators with techniques by which large masses of information on offenders can be processed, resulting in the sorting of these individuals into ad hoc "types" that are useful for various administrative purposes, assignments, and kindred decisions (p. 171).

To conclude the argument in favour of specific empirically derived classifications of offenders, it may, therefore, be observed that important differences do exist between such criminal acts as violence, rape, embezzlement, arson, organized racketeering, and other kinds of law-breaking and between the people who carry them out. Then there are differences between individuals who commit the same type of crime. For example, it is hard to deny that there are important differences among professional killers, or psychopathic murderers or "normal" individuals who kill in an interactional situations. In the Pakistani context too, one can easily observe such differences not only among the offenders of different types of crimes, but also among the committers of one specific type of crime (Tariq and Durrani, 1983). For example, the personality and the background characteristics of a murderer who commits murder while committing robbery in an urban setting is to be explained in a different way from that of a villager who commits murder under the pressure of the social value of taking revenge, or on some interpersonal dispute in an interactional situation.

Analyzing the failure of typological efforts in criminality one may note that the most previous efforts to classify criminals have been defied because of the efforts to search for "crime specialists" among offenders, and classify them into some crime-specific categories. As shown above, it seems quite clear now that there are no such individuals who specialize in specific forms of criminal acts to the exclusion of other offenses. Therefore, it will be futile to base a typology primarily on some specific form

of criminality. The variety and heterogeneity and the fact that there is a continuous crime switching among real life offenders would defeat any typological effort. Therefore, to develop a typology which is basically limited to specific forms of criminal acts, like naive cheque forgers, pick-pockets, thieves, and burglars, etc., is no doubt going to be a fruitless effort.

However, one may empirically discover types of offenders among the population of criminals for limited but still important purposes. Property offenders, for example, could be a broad type of criminals who despite differences in their predatory acts they commit, may differ from, say murderers, or rapists. If this is so, the identification is going to be helpful for psychologists, and other social scientists for etiological explanations as well in their efforts aimed at effective handling of such criminals. In fact, the efforts directed towards corrections and rehabilitation of prisoners during imprisonment and after release have been shown to be effective if the differences in nature of criminality, personality and background characteristics were taken into consideration. In some other studies, it has been shown that classification of inmates into management and program-relevant groups resulted in reduction in both the seriousness and frequency of disruptive inmate behaviour (for reviews of offender management classification schemes, see Austin, 1983; Gottfredson & Tonry, 1987). Atwood et al. (1989) observe that research in typologies of delinquents may be critical for enhancing our understanding of effective treatments. This realization seems to have followed the failure of many treatment programs conducted without any regard to the types of delinquents receiving those programs (Berger, Crowley, Gold & Gray, 1975; Davidson, Render, Blakely, Mitchell & Emshoff 1987; Empey & Erickson, 1972; Klein, 1971). It has been now increasingly realized that the effectiveness of treatment programs could greatly improve if it is determined which type of individual responds to which type of treatment (Rutter & Giller, 1984). However, the criticism on such schemes has been based on one main point that these have been developed mainly for management purpose rather than as theoretically meaningful taxonomies (see, for

example, Gibbons, 1988, p.9). Nevertheless, if these classification schemes can help towards etiological explanations of various forms of criminal behaviour and if these can be of some practical use for effective handling, treatment, and rehabilitation of prisoners, the development of such classifications should be considered a venture worth undertaking.

It is quite difficult to encompass the diversity of criminal behaviour into some typological scheme, but it is also evident that these behaviours *are* different from each other and their committers do denote some types. Criminality of all individuals can not be explained by any global theory. Each criminal is likely to have unique motivational patterns, environmental conditions and personality development. Therefore, their criminal acts are to be explained with the help of different theories which are closely interrelated but explain basically different criminal acts. To illustrate, murder may be explained either by psychological theories of aggression or with sociological and cultural explanations. Similarly, white-collar criminality may be explained by the pressures and 'demands' of business, and theft and pick-pocketing may be understood by the social conditions prevailing in poverty and destitute stricken homes. Rape could be a result of either aggression or an outcome of unequal distribution of sexual expressions in a given community and so on.

One may therefore, concentrate on a particular target population, such as affluent white collar criminals in business settings who mostly evade taxes and hoodwink law. Or one may pay attention to inmates of prisons and try to discover some types among them which could be etiological significant and practically useful to discover. Studying white-collar criminals, for example, may lead to some useful insights which in turn may enable the society to curb and deal with white-collar criminality more effectively. Similarly studying types among prison inmates may prove to be rewarding as far as legal process of prosecution and effective management and handling of prisons are concerned.

III—OFFENDERS TYPES AND EXPLANATIONS OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR

As noted above, the importance of discovering types of crimes and criminals has been mainly because of the theorists' efforts towards understanding and explaining criminal behaviour. In fact, investigations into processes and factors which lead persons to criminal acts have been carried out since long by researchers belonging to disciplines like sociology and psychology. Broadly speaking, three types of explanations regarding the etiology of criminality have been brought forward, namely biogenic, sociogenic, and psychogenic. In a few pages to follow are presented resume of these explanations in the light of which will be explained the criminal behaviour of Professional and Non-professional criminals as conceptualized in this research.

Biogenic Explanations:

As early as 19th Century, Lombroso and other researchers after him, proposed that criminals had physically primitive and inferior characteristics. Since then a chain of biogenic explanations were propounded to explain criminality which viewed criminals as persons who were, in the words of Vold and Bernard (1986) "somehow characteristically different, abnormal, defective, and therefore, inferior biologically". However, theories considering purely biological factors as causally related to criminality have failed to provide conclusive evidence in this regard. Biological factors alone as explanations of criminal behaviour are not acceptable to most criminologists and others would accommodate only a biosocial approach in criminality which argues that human behaviour is influenced by interaction between biological and genetic factors, on the one hand, and social experiences and environmental conditions, on the other (for a review of biosocial processes involved

in the development of criminality (see Ellis, 1984; Shah & Roth, 1974; Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985).

One of the most popular theories of criminal behaviour has been that criminals are feeble-minded or very low in intellectual abilities (Goddard, 1914). Gibbons (1987), however, observes:

that the simple hereditary transmission view of feeble-mindedness is erroneous. The involvement of successive generations of individuals in deviant behaviour is probably the result of *social* transmission. Socially inadequate persons fail to provide adequate socialization experiences to their offspring (p.23).

Bartol and Bartol (1986) also observe that the relationship between low intellectual ability as measured by intelligence tests may be related to delinquency and criminality not because deviants are intellectually inferior but because they have been exposed to such poor socio-economic conditions which do not stimulate intellectual enrichment. Similarly, Menard and Morse (1984) argued that low intelligence levels may be related to delinquency and crime also because of the differential treatment by teachers and parents towards those youths who show poor academic achievement. Hirschi and Hindelang's (1977) comprehensive review of the literature, however, tends to show that relationship does exist independent of socio-economic class, that is, upper and middle class deviants also seem to have low IQs than upper and middle class non-deviants (see also Loeber and Dishion, 1983). It is quite possible that lower levels of intellectual ability are related to criminality through an interactive effect of biological and social factors.

Though modern research on crime and biological factors such as chemical imbalances of the brain, neurological dysfunctions, effects of brain tumours, various

disorders of the limbic system, epilepsy, and endocrine abnormalities, etc. has reawakened the interest in biological influences in criminality, still a major portion of research highlights the biosocial interactive process in criminality. Glueck and Glueck (1956) and Cortes and Gatti (1972), for example, discovered that mesomorphic - athletic and muscular body types - were found more frequently among offenders than among non-offenders because through a process of social selection such individuals get themselves involved into activities which are often transgressions of the legal dictates. Similarly, Pollock, Mendic and Gabrielli (1983) and Hutchings and Mednick (1977), on the basis of their studies on twins, and adopted children concluded that there is found a greater concordance of behaviour including criminal behaviour among identical twins as compared with fraternal twins as well as between biological fathers and adoptees compared with adoptive fathers and adoptees. Interesting is to note in adoption studies that when both the biological and adoptive fathers were criminal, the chances were much greater that the adoptee would also be criminal than if only one man was criminal (Hutchings & Mednick (1977). This only weakens the evidence in favour of purely genetic factors. Hutchings and Mednick concluded that genetic factors are important and seem to produce a tendency or disposition towards criminality, but environmental factors are also very important in any relationship between genetics and criminality. The studies on twins also suggest that the identical twins undergo more similar social environmental experiences than do the fraternal twins. Similarly, age at the time of adoption, the experiences prior to adoption and the selection of adoptive families were important social factors in determining any relationships between genetic factors and criminality. Mednick (1980) observed that "...There is no suggestion in these findings that biological factors predestine criminality in some inevitable, fateful manner. Rather they suggest that there must be some biosocial interaction at work."

Eysenck's (1977) biopsychological theory of personality suggests that individuals high on 'extraversion' and 'neuroticism' are more likely to be deviants.

To him, the characteristics of "extraversion" and "neuroticism" are determined by peculiarities of central and peripheral nervous systems and thus are inherited. To Eysenck, the way each individual's nervous system functions may be as unique as his or her personality characteristics. These inherited characteristics may affect an individual's ability to conform to societal rules and conduct norms. Thus, Eysenck seems to believe that a theory of criminal behaviour may be developed by investigating the biological make-up and socialization history of each individual. Eysenck (1973) observes, "Crime cannot be understood in terms of heredity alone, but it can also not be understood in terms of environment alone" (p. 171). Eysenck & Eysenck (1970) also suggest that different combinations of environmental, biological and personality factors give rise to different types of crime. This position is close to the general thesis of the present research that different personalities are more susceptible to certain crimes than others.

The research on xyy chromosomal pattern recently investigated and attributed to criminality is sparse and has produced inconclusive findings. It has also been argued that xyy pattern is so rare in the population that it cannot be considered a major causal factor in criminality. It has also been suggested that as individuals having xyy chromosomal pattern are relatively tall, they, like Glueck and Glueck's (1956) mesomorphs, may be physically better off to fight and bully others. Moreover, courts and psychiatrists may be biased against them and thus may judge them 'mentally sick' or 'guilty' because their extraordinary physical structure may look threatening (Fox, 1971; Sarbin & Miller, 1970).

To conclude, one may say that genetics may play a role in criminality, but (a) it is only a partial one, (b) it affects in interaction with certain social and psychological variables, and (c) it is relevant only to some forms of criminality as there are many illegal acts which can be explained by social factors.

Sociogenic Theories

Most sociologists-criminologist would consider certain criminogenic influences in the social order as root causes of criminality. Their main assumption is that the social structure, cultural values and social processes largely determine all behaviour - deviant or non-deviant. To most of them "modern nations are "criminogenic" - that is, they contain forms of social structure that engender or produce criminality" (Gibbons, 1987, p. 105).

There are variety of social structural factors, collectively known as Differential Social Organization, which generate criminality or criminogenic influences. For example, unavailability of legitimate opportunities for the attainment of those goals which are commonly held in a society and which are exalted to a great extent, could lead to many forms of criminal behaviour. Inequal and unjust distribution of sources, high unemployment, poor education, over population, and other such problems related to economic, social and political disorganization are considered the major culprits producing crime in a society. Moreover, political-economic structure of the corporate capitalist societies produces large number of crimes particularly the white-collar crimes.

Another aspect of criminogenic nature of modern societies is the industrialization and resultant impersonality and loose social bonds among citizens as a result of which persons are less inhibited to commit crimes (Smigel, 1970; Zimbardo, 1969). Rapid social change, stress on material gains, and movement of rural populations towards cities are some other factors which add to differential social organization which in turn results in social problems including criminality.

Other examples of social structural factors related to criminality could be subcultural patterns that encourage law-breaking. Group values that deviate from

society's norms lead to many a serious crimes by the group members individually as well as collectively. The subcultural values exist in almost all societies of the world. In American society, for example, there exists a subculture of violence in which the group members are extremely suspicious of one another and are prone to use physical aggression in interpersonal interaction (Gibbons, 1987, p. 226). Similarly, the preponderance of forcible rape among working class groups in America could be attributed to these subcultural attitudes towards sexuality and physical force. In Pakistan the beating of wives by their husband among rural peasants and urban working class are similar examples (see Kanwar, 1989; Tariq 1981).

Social-psychological Theories

It should be noted that we often talk about criminality in collective terms, such as, crime patterns, rates, and distributions in a given society. However, actually the behaviour of particular criminal individuals remains the ultimate unit of analysis. After all these are individual criminals who commit variety of illegal acts and make-up rates of robbery, thefts, rape, and other kinds of criminal behaviour in the society. Therefore, there must be some peculiarities of the individuals which make them vulnerable to the adverse effects of criminogenic influences. In other words, there must be some intervening variable which drive some individuals to criminality but not others. This takes us to the question what is the "process" by which an individual develops criminal patterns of behaviour.

Some sociologists and psychologists have propounded social-psychological theories of criminal behaviour which attempt at explaining the process through which an individual becomes criminal in life without any recourse to biological factors or intrapsychic unconscious personality motivations (discussion on these would follow shortly). Sutherland & Cressey's (1978) theory of differential association, for example, suggests that some forms of law-breaking are learned as the

result of lengthy, consistent and intense associations of individual's with those who themselves have criminal codes and norms of conduct. Akers (1985) elaborated Sutherland and Cressey's principles of differential associations in the light of social learning theoretical perspectives. He proposes that most deviant behaviour is learned according to the principles of operant conditioning, and then retained depending upon the amount, frequency, and probability of reinforcement the individual experiences by performing criminal acts. Sutherland and Cressey's principles of differential association, and Bandura's (1973) modeling are acknowledged by Akers as important factors in the initial acquisition of criminal behaviour. But, to him, some sort of social reinforcement is required if behaviour is to be continued.

The associations with criminal elements, the learning of behaviour for monetary, social or psychological gains, and continuation of criminal behaviour due to reinforcement might as well result in the development of criminal attitudes and motives. Bartol & Bartol (1986) suggest that the persons' "generalized expectancies" (attitudes and motives), that are stable and consistent across relatively similar situations, make them 'stay' in criminal behaviour. They observe:

When people engage in unlawful conduct, they expect to gain something in the form of status, power, affection, material goods, or living conditions. People who act unlawfully perceive and interpret the situation and select what they consider to be the most effective behaviour under the circumstances. Usually, when people act violently, they do so because that approach has been used successfully in the past (p. 84-85).

Thus, attitudes and motives seem to be important as individual characteristics or attributes that differentiate offenders from non-offenders. The importance of the study of these personality characteristics and other psychological factors have been

duly acknowledged by many sociologist-criminologists. Gibbons (1987), for example, observes:

Common-sense observations and psychological research both point to the salience of individual differences in human conduct such concepts as role and status do not entirely capture the richness and variability of human behaviour. Individuals embark upon particular lines of conduct, in part, because of specific personality characteristics they exhibit. If this argument is valid one, it has consequences for causal analysis in criminology. Individual A may become enmeshed in law-breaking, in part because of his or her particular psychological make-up, while individual B, from a similar social background, refrains from misconduct, because he or she differs psychologically from A (p. 229).

To these psychological factors we now turn.

Psychogenic Explanations

As purely biological explanations failed to achieve any acceptance from most criminologists, the psychological explanations at intrapsychic levels too could not hold for long. The hypothesis that criminals suffer from psychoses or any other mental disorder has been refuted time and again mainly on the grounds that mentally disordered persons were found among offenders populations as less or more frequently as they were in the normal populations (for a review, see Monahan, 1981).

However, if evidence has refuted the claim that most forms of criminality involve personality pathology, it by no means, rules out the possibility that personality deviations may be implicated in certain forms of criminality. Many researcher, therefore, tended to believe that criminality does not seem to be caused by

some gross pathology, rather it is outcome of certain subtle forms of pathology. The early propounders of this view explained the development of deviant behaviour as one way of responding to certain personality problems. For example, psychoanalytic theory (initially propounded by Freud and later extended to crime researchers like Abrahamsen (1960), Alchhorn (1955) and Friedlander (1971) explained criminality as a product of repression, guilt, and unconscious motivations, etc.

However, Psychoanalytic theory and its relevance to criminality have been subjected to severe criticism (Vold & Bernard, 1986). Vagueness in formulations, untestability of basic constructs, too much emphasis on biological motivation, such as instincts and infantile sexuality, exaggerated significance attached to early experiences of infants and virtually no importance given to social factors and cultural variables were some of the main drawbacks pointed out. Some might argue that there do exist irrational, compulsive, and obsessive criminals, but they surely do not exist in great numbers.

Alternate to the unconscious motivation hypothesis of the psychoanalytic perspective is the theory that criminality is caused by adverse home conditions and defective socializations of the individuals. Earlier researchers (e.g., Burt, 1944; Healy & Bronner, 1926) attributed criminality, at least some forms of it, to emotional impairment and extreme unhappy and adverse experiences in life particularly the Early Home Environmental Conditions, parent-child tensions and other such relationships. Recent evidence only partially supports the general-personality-problems being associated with criminality and many critical reviews of the perspective have been prepared (see, for example, Gibbons & Krohn, 1986; Hakeem 1958; Tennenbaum, 1977; Waldo & Dinitz, 1967). Further research evidence is discussed in chapter 2, while describing Early Home Environmental Conditions of Professional and Non-professional criminals.

Conclusions

The above review leads us to some important conclusions. Biogenic explanations of criminality have not provided any conclusive evidence so far, and bio-social and biopsychological interpretations of criminality having produced convincing evidence still need more research to make further progress in that direction. As far as the psychogenic explanations are concerned, it has been seen that offenders do not alone suffer from mental disorders, non-offenders also do. Psychoanalytic explanations are ambiguous and do not explain all or even major forms of criminality. Many offenders commit crimes for conscious motives or/and for situational reasons.

It is clear from the above account that various theories of criminality have been offered by criminologists. Among them, psychologists-criminologists too have different perspectives as explanations for the development of criminal behaviour among different "types" of individuals. Some find faults in the 'person' – being mentally sick or having some hereditary endowments leading him to 'criminal' ways of life. The other consider his peculiar reactions to certain environmental factors responsible for most criminal behaviour. Still others believe that hereditary and harming factors in the environment operate in an interactive manner to destine individuals to a criminal life. Cognitive factors as mediating between personal and environmental forces also are conceived as crucial in forming attitudes and behaviour which are deviant or criminal in nature. Most psychologists would thus contend that different etiological factors produce different types of crimes and criminals.

The psychological, particularly psychoanalytic concepts on criminality failed to get any acceptance not only because of their untestability but also because the psychoanalytic theories about the defective character and psychological theories

about intrapsychic causes of antisocial behaviour do not fit in with the fashionable view held by sociologists - criminologists that criminal behaviours are socially determined reactions and natural expressions of the tensions existing between the powerful and less powerful groups in the society. Moreover, the notion of criminal tendency being a persistent, individualized trait runs counter to modern research on the situational determinants of law breaking, which we will shortly discuss. Psychologically baleful influences of deprivations and destitute conditions and allegedly resultant criminality failed to impress much as the criminality of white-collar criminals is not a very unknown phenomena. Then the rehabilitative and reformatory efforts made by psychologists and psychiatrists towards modifying behaviour of criminals and delinquents have not met any spectacular success. In fact, the treatment strategies recommended by psychologists and psychiatrists have been often taken and severely criticized as efforts towards social and political control (West, 1988, p. 77).

Despite all this criticism on psychological orientation to understanding of the criminal behaviour, psychologists seem to have made very important contributions in criminology and many related areas. It is quite obvious that all criminals do not manifest any of the classic psychiatric syndromes and are not regarded by themselves or their associates as being mentally sick. Many social psychologists do realize that all criminality cannot be explained with reference only to the "person" – no matter how he came to be what he is. There are situations and circumstances which will lead many law-abiding individuals most considerate of human and civic rights, to commission of even most heinous crimes. This observation highlights the importance of the context of the action or the situation in which the behaviour takes place. The psychologists do realize that there are different types of criminals some committing crimes only because their personalities and behavioural patterns developed the way they are, and others indulging into criminal acts mainly because of the situational pressures.

Certainly, many forms of criminality could be readily explained in terms of situational factors without having to resort to any biological or psychological deviance. Considerable evidence exists which shows that many persons drift into misconduct or just unwillingly become involved in it. One should keep in mind that there are innumerable laws which impinge upon persons and cross-currents of conflicting group affiliations and other pressures experienced by individuals which may lead them to commission of criminal acts. Therefore, much law-breaking behaviour may arise out of some combination of situational pressures and circumstances along with opportunities for criminality known in criminological literature as mechanistic - situational - dynamic view (Sutherland & Cressey, 1978, p. 79-80). Situations and processes occurring at or near the incidence of criminal act, are considered solely the 'causes' of crime.

We will shortly see (in the next section on crime scene in Pakistan) that many a crimes of murder and serious hurts, etc, particularly in the rural areas are committed in interactional situations on interpersonal disputes on spur of a moment. The argument is as follows: It is erroneous to assume that motivation and causes of criminal acts are always 'inside the person'. There are many criminals who may not be any more motivated to engage in criminality than the non-offenders. Their criminal acts may be the result of situations which are totally 'outside the person'. On that account, they may be not very much different from non-criminals at least at the point of initial involvement in criminal act. This may mean that traditional views of causal relationship may not hold for many criminals.

However, psychologists assert that these apparently normal criminals may display characteristics deviating in degree or in kind from the norms of the general population. After all, they argue, any subgroup of the population is likely to have peculiar characteristics. Therefore, psychologists, main interest about criminality has been to look for those characteristics which might differentiate criminals from

non-criminals. (For further discussion on personality characteristics as measured by personality tests and their relationship with criminality, see chapter 2).

Most criminologist would thus argue that some causal process has taken inside the person much earlier than the precipitating situations. After all individual differences can not be ignored. It is difficult to deny that different persons will define the same objective situation differently. Only those individuals will engage in criminal act who perceive the situation as conducive for criminality, who are hard pressed (by social values, etc.) to violate the legal code and who are motivated in some other way to engage in criminality. Thus, the individual's disposition and his personality pattern may also have a determining factor whether or not he or she will engage in criminality. Therefore, the hypothesis that criminals are different, at least in some social-psychological terms, from the non-criminals seems to carry some weight.

The present researcher tends to believe that developmental causal factors, such as earlier life experiences of offenders, associations with criminal elements in the society, and learning and maintaining of criminal behaviour are differentially related to criminality. In certain crimes, like a murder committed in an interpersonal situation, a long-term developmental process may not always operate. The situational elements such as the provocation, attractions of immediate gains of deviant acts, or societal expectations from individuals in certain well-defined situations may produce many acts of law-breaking.

On the other hand, in certain other forms of criminality and regarding some other kinds of criminals, the historical or background, developmental and causal factors may be very powerful and of a considerable importance. For example, many sex offenses, senseless killings, compulsive stealing and other criminal acts of the sort can not be explained by situational factors and one has to look for causes in the

personality structures of the offenders. At times, the personality problems are understood in the light of family experiences, parental-child interactions, and parent-parent relations.

The present researcher feels that most of the previous work has not given due attention to variations among offenders and have tried to explain all different types of crimes and criminals with one or limited theoretical perspective. Mostly, heterogeneous samples of prisoners were administered questionnaires and personality tests to make comparisons and draw conclusions. Only a few researchers realized that prisoners are prisoners for a number of diverse reasons. The result has been that most of the work failed to produce any conclusive evidence. The basic premise in the present research is that where crimes of Professional criminals can be explained with the help of social learning theory taking into account adverse early home environmental conditions and defective socialization, the crimes of Non-professional criminal would be explainable with the help of sociological-cultural influences and situational factors, giving due attention to psychological correlates which surely operate in a particular socio-cultural milieu.

IV—THE CRIME SCENE IN PAKISTAN AND OFFENDER TYPES

The cultural specificity in criminal behaviour is to be considered if types of criminals are to be identified and classification schemes are to be developed in a given society. It is often said that every social phenomenon, may it be a virtue or a vice, is the outcome of the functioning of a society, and is shaped by its social and cultural values. Crime in Pakistan is no exception. Owing to its peculiar social, economic, and cultural conditions, the crime, in all its characteristics, is bound to have a peculiar nature in the country. In fact, crime is a human act considered undesirable, bad, or illegal from the view point of the social conventional and moral values of a society. Legal statutes are reflection of some of these values. As our social values, moral teachings and legal statutes are different from those of other lands in the world, it is expected that the crime, its nature and its etiology are also peculiar and specific. Therefore, indigenous theories may be required for the understanding of the criminal behaviour in the Pakistani context. The scientific study of criminal behaviour has been virtually non-existent in Pakistan. Therefore, in any effort to study criminal behaviour in this country, there is a need to concentrate on exploring a multitude of factors to the extent that a culture specific theory explaining criminal behaviour in the local context could be evolved and empirically tested.

Law does not take cognizance of offenses against the moral order unless they are prohibited by the legal order as well. Neither does it incorporate or even consider the social values which may, in certain cases, be stimulating, encouraging and reinforcing certain human acts declared illegal by the law. In Pakistan, for example, taking revenge is such a highly reinforced social value that individuals frequently take law in their own hands and personally avenge the wrongs done to them (Kanwar, 1989; Tariq & Durrani, 1983). People without any apparent proneness to commit crime, or any criminal life-style, kill their friends, close relatives, wives and their

lovers only because they think that if they do not do so, their honour and ego would be at stake. Thus, many a crime take place here only because a situation with tremendous amount of social pressure compels for the commission of an illegal act. People, instead of abiding by the law succumb to the pressure of social situations, and commit an act which may be legally criminal but they feel that not committing it would be a social stigma. This is the natural outcome of cultural impacts and socialization processes.

Moreover, the inability of the community to resolve the problems of its members promptly and effectively may lead to many disputes and eventually to many crimes. The failing power-structure in the community, the breaking of "panchayat" and "Jirga" systems (informal courts consisting of local nobles as judges) in the villages are in fact symptoms of social disorganization causing much of disregard to both social norms and law. Moreover, a crime, particularly in villages of Pakistan, seem to be just the outcome of some intrinsic defects in different administrative agencies like irrigation and revenue departments. Their inefficient functioning and defective systems lead to many disputes particularly on land and its irrigation, which may in turn, lead to heinous crimes like murder, assault, and even kidnapping and rape, etc. (Tariq & Durrani, 1983).

The general crime situation and the cultural environments of Pakistan in which the crimes of murder, serious hurt and some of kidnappings and rapes take place, suggest that these violent acts are committed mostly by normal and otherwise law-abiding citizens. It has also been observed that these types of criminals are not likely to show any symptoms of psychological aberrations or disorders, personality disorders or problems, or any background histories as broken homes or any other adverse Early Home Environmental Conditions. Their crimes are, in fact, the product of a societal system, prevalent cultural values and situational provocations, etc. These criminals are not the ones who permanently pose any serious threat to the society,

despite the heinous crimes of murder and assault they commit. Recidivism, particularly with reference to murder and serious hurt, does not seem to be high among these criminals. Kanwar (1989) reports that only six out of 600 were recidivists among his samples of murderers. They could be called "Non-professional" criminals as they mostly commit crimes of murders, serious hurts and sometimes even kidnapping and rape, etc. under the pressure of social values or/and in interpersonal situations replete with conflicts, disputes and tensions (Tariq & Durrani, 1983). These are called Non-professional because most of them are one-time losers, hardly ever repeating their crimes. Kanwar (1989) observes that "—most murderers are not hard core criminals and do not possess the characteristics of a professional criminal" (p.207). He further observes that "...violent subculture is not established (in Pakistan)" (p. 207). Still at another place he observes that "...most murderers are not hardened by criminal activities. They often do not have a previous criminal record" (p. 210). Therefore, one may say that these criminals are not the "Professional" type and do not manifest any criminal way of life. The real menace is, in fact, caused by those criminals who are property offenders and are mostly repeaters. These are popularly known as professionals, habituals, "history-sheeters", etc.

The former types of criminals and their criminal acts need the attention of sociologists, political scientists, psychologists, and all other agents of social reform and social change, because to put an end to the types of crimes they commit, one needs to bring about basic changes in the social and cultural fabric of the society. The other group of criminals, however, require the immediate steps on the part of law-enforcing agencies to be more efficient, modern, honest, and hardworking. Where former types of crime are more peculiar to the Pakistani context owing to the specific cultural and socio-economic milieu of country, the latter types of crime are universal and show little variation from one society to the other.

Pakistani Property offenders most of whom we have been labelled as Professional criminals in this research as a broad class of criminals may differ from many murderers, assaulters, and other sexual offenders. Some of these belong to criminal subculture. But the organized crime is relatively a recent phenomenon in Pakistan, and criminal subculture areas are mostly restricted to the large cities. In Karachi and Lahore, for example, crimes like prostitution, stealing, robbery, gambling and even some sort of swinging are perhaps quite common. Kanwar (1989) speaks of two deviant subcultural classifications in the major cities of Pakistan. The first is the subculture where there is petty gambling, drug use, petty thefts, robberies, clique or gang forming, gang fighting and so on. Some of these may also be committing serious crimes of robbery, organized thefts, and other illegal acts for unlawful property and monetary gains. However, most of them are likely to be in the prisons quite often because of their unsophisticated property offenses or just as scape-goats for the crimes of more influential ones outside the prisons. Kanwar (1989) observes:

Perhaps the majority of offenders in the jail, are being punished for their crimes, but there seems to be a number of them who committed no crime. They are there because they are paying for some one else's crimes. This is not hearsay; this is another form of corruption in Pakistan. These people become victims of the family system. They are there either because the real criminal was economically, socially and politically powerful enough to frame them for his crime or because they were bought to pay for some one else's crime, or because they had no available means to prove their innocence. For outsiders these people are as criminal as real offenders. People in this group suffer more or less from lack of formal education, deprivations, frustrations, insanities, etc. They seem to have a problem of adjustment to the culture at large (p. 49).

The second deviant category has been described by Kanwar (1989):

The group of people in the so-called high society, the upper class. Some people in this class seem to have two fronts— one, hypocrite, for society at large and the other, the real, for themselves (their front and backstage behaviour). It is their "real" way of life (backstage behaviour) that is classified here as a deviant subculture. It is this group that promotes, more often than not, anti-social behaviours like prostitution, dancing and call-girls, premarital and extramarital sexual relations and swinging (in few cases), as well as gambling, tax evasion, alcohol abuse, smuggling, bribing and influencing the state agents, and so on (p. 49-50).

Recently the political crimes and the crimes carried on by those involved in organized criminal activity like drug trafficking have risen high in number. However, these and other such activities are not easily controllable as the committers of these crimes are well-organized and highly influential. Therefore, despite the increase in political crimes, white-collar criminality, and crimes committed by those involved in drug trafficking, there is not likely to be any increase in the conviction rate or in the population of prisons in the country.

The research design of this study is based on the assumption, that offenders types exist among total population of criminals. However, because of the heterogeneity found in criminal behaviour, and the crime-switching observed among criminals, typological schemes so far postulated have not succeeded as most of them have failed to stand tests of empirical verification. Nevertheless, this failure does not undermine the importance of empirically derived types which may have some theoretical value and practical implications. Such types are manifested in observed differences in criminal acts, social-psychological characteristics of the criminals and in situations in which their criminal acts take place. Furthermore, it is also assumed that behavioural and social-psychological changes in criminal acts and their "actors" take place, but these are "limited, orderly and identifiable" (Gibbons 1965, p. 45).

In the present research which employs convicted prisoners as its subjects, two types were identified. The convicts who had committed crimes against person in interactional situations on interpersonal conflicts and disputes were considered as one 'type' of criminals and were labelled as "Non-professional criminals". The other broad type of offenders which are likely to be found in Pakistani prisons are those who repeatedly engage in criminal acts, mostly property offenses, and who generally exhibit a criminal way of life. These were labelled as "Professionals". Then the research proceeds to highlight differences between the two groups with important implications.

CHAPTER 2

PURPOSE, VARIABLES AND HYPOTHESES

I-PURPOSE AND PLAN OF THE RESEARCH

The main purpose in the present research is to see whether or not the Pakistani criminals (defined for this research as convicts of Pakistani prisons) can be meaningfully classified in two broad categories which the present author would like to call Professional and Non-professional criminals. The assumptions behind the proposed classification is that there are many individuals whose behaviour can be better understood in terms of "professionalness" or "non-professionalness" of their acts. These two types are, however, not to be obtained from any specific theoretical typological scheme. Neither do these preclude other types. Rather, they are two empirically elicited types differing on certain operationally definable offense-and-offender related variables and manifesting differences on some background characteristics and personality variables which may have etiological significance, theoretical meaningfulness, and practical implications.

The objectives of the present research have been achieved by dividing the work into a number of stages. These stages and the analyses carried out at each of these have been described below:

Stage I: Identification and Description of Classifying Variables

The first stage was to identify those variables which were to form the basis of classification. In the present research, five such variables have been identified on the

basis of relevant research. The variables are *Type of Crime, Past Criminal Record, Relationship with the Victim, Premeditation, and Criminal Associations*.

Stage II: Assessment of Folk Concept of a Professional Criminal

The above mentioned five offense-related variables and one demographic variable, namely Occupational Life Pattern were employed to explore the folk concept of a Pakistani Professional criminal using representatives of law-enforcing agencies and general public (sample A) as the sources of information. Specifically, it was investigated whether or not researcher's conceptualization of a Professional criminal tallied with that of the lay man and significant others.

Stage III: Classification into Professional and Non-professional Criminals.

Findings of the research at stage II (exploring folk concept of a Professional criminal in the Pakistani context) lent further support to the selection of Classifying Variables as being relevant to classification of criminals into the two proposed categories, namely Professional and Non-professional criminals. At stage III two research objectives were achieved. (a) The randomly selected sample of 240 convicted prisoners (sample B) were classified into the two proposed categories; (b) Furthermore, the two groups thus elicited were compared with each other on Demographic Variables and Early Home Environmental Conditions to see the theoretical meaningfulness of the proposed classification of the criminals.

Stage IV: Replication and comparison on Personality Characteristics

The findings of classification and comparison of two types of criminals comprising of sample B at stage III led to important realizations and further research work. For example, the findings at stage III suggested that sample B was biased having

an over representation of one type of crime namely, violence against person and it was realized that a stratified random sample should be selected for replication of findings of data on sample B. Therefore, to counter this bias, 120 convicted prisoners (sample c) were selected on the basis of a stratified random sampling by type of crime (details are given in chapter 3).

Another factor which led to the selection of sample C was that as Early Home Environmental Conditions were investigated through subjects' retrospective reports with in-depth clinical interviewing, this only looked into the past of the subjects. Considering the problems entailed in retrospective data and realizing the importance of studying present personality structures of the subjects, some relevant personality characteristics were explored employing sample C. These subjects were also classified into two groups of Professional and Non-professional criminals and compared with each other on three personality characteristics, namely Socialization, Self-esteem, and Acting-out behaviour.

Stage V: A Comparison of Criminals and Non-criminals on 'Acting-out' Personality Characteristic

The findings on personality characteristics of Acting-out (aggressive) behaviour of Professional and Non-professional criminals stage IV led to the selection of sample D of non-criminals for a comparison of Criminals and Non-criminals on Acting-out behaviour.

II-VARIABLES OF THE RESEARCH

In the following are given detailed descriptions of the variables which are included in the research work carried out at different stages mentioned above. First of all, the rationale and definitions of the Classifying Variables are given on which the

proposed classification of prisoners is based. After that, the rationale of studying the folk concept of a Professional criminal

has been described. Next to that are given descriptions and rationale of the Demographic Variables included in the study. Early Home Environmental Conditions have been outlined and operationally defined after the descriptions of Demographic Variables. At the end comes the rationale of studying three Personality Characteristics, namely Socialization, Self-esteem, and Acting-out behaviour of the criminals.

CLASSIFYING VARIABLES

In literature on offender typologies some of which has been reviewed in chapter I, there are scores of variables which different researchers have identified to serve as the basis of their classification schemes. Most of them are offense-related factors which include type of crime, the frequency and the consistency with which a particular criminal act is committed (the past criminal record, etc.) and the skill with which a criminal executes his criminal acts along with information regarding the use of violence in his crimes. Other researchers in their effort to identify 'types' have gone to the extent of tracing offender-related background factors of alleged etiological significance such as family environmental variables, the peer relations, and the other life experiences of the offenders and conditions prevailing in their environments. Still others have included certain personality characteristics as differentiating factors between various types of criminals.

It should be noted here that in some previous researches, (e.g. Gibbons, 1968, McKenna, 1972), the variables or definitional statements about offender types were kept distinct from their background characteristics. The most important of reasons for this was that the variables defining types of crimes or criminals involved

explanations different from the ones related to background characteristics. Moreover, empirical verification of the 'types' based on Classifying Variables alone has greater precision in classification if the hypotheses regarding background and personality characteristics are kept separate. However, Gibbons' propositions related to definitional dimensions are a mixture of offense-related and personality related characteristics, the former defining 'actual deviant role behaviour', and the latter defining certain "role-related social-psychological characteristics". It can be argued here that if social-psychological characteristics are assumed to lead individuals to criminal roles, only then these can be included in the category of background characteristics having some etiological significance. Gibbons seems to be aware of this problem and therefore restricts these definitional dimensions to "role-related" social-psychological characteristics perhaps suggesting that by virtue of their 'roles', the criminals have attitudes and self-concepts of peculiar nature, ruling out, to some extent, the possibility of these characteristics having any contribution to the development of criminal roles they adopt and perform in their lives.

The researcher of this study contends that there could be several potentially discriminating variables for classification of Pakistani prisoners. These could be related either to the offense an individual commits (e.g. type, frequency, gravity, skill, use of violence, etc.) or it could relate to the offender's personality, background experiences and the environmental conditions in which he lived. Victim characteristics can also be relevant to study as discriminating variables. In the present research, following variables have been identified on the basis of relevant research and, more importantly, considering the socio-economic and cultural conditions of the Pakistani society (see, for example, Kanwar, 1989; Tariq & Durrani, 1983). The variables are: (1) Type of Crime (both latest and previous, if any), (2) Past Criminal Record, (3) Relationship with the Victim, (4) Premeditation, and (5) Criminal Associations. The rationale of their selection and operational definitions are being described shortly. However, it may be observed here that to decide upon those

variables which only identify types and have no etiological significance is quite difficult. The Classifying Variables in this research are assumed to have no etiological value, yet the variables like Past Criminal Record and frequent encounters with law-enforcing agencies, particularly the stay in prison, can very much have their etiological influence. Another point to be noted is that the classification of a criminal subject is not tied with any specific type of criminal act. Rather, it is based on the assumption that "criminal" types exist with recurrent forms of specific domain of criminal activity nature of which may change from one criminal act to the other, but the offense related behavioural pattern of the criminal does not change that rapidly. The assumptions about these changes are similar to the ones held by Gibbons (1985) who observes that "—though behavioural and social-psychological changes occur in specific criminal roles during the development of the role, these changes are limited, orderly, and identifiable" (p.45). It has been further assumed that these criminal types would exhibit uniform demographic, background and personality characteristics.

The postulated differences among the two groups of criminals (labelled as Professional and Non-professional criminals) on the Classifying Variables included in this research are described below. The operational definitions of the variables and guidelines for classification are also given.

(a) Type of Crime

The number and nature of criminal acts people may commit are extremely large and diverse. Moreover, it is quite frequent that an individual is charged, tried and sentenced for more than one offense at one time. However, for Professional criminals, crime is a source of living and, therefore, they mostly engage themselves in a variety of non-violent property crimes. Non-professional criminals, on the contrary, commit mostly crimes of murder, assault, etc. However, a few exceptions to this general observation may be identified and explained in the Pakistani context.

For example: (a) those who commit crimes against person (murder, etc.) while committing crimes like robbery, burglary, etc. (property crimes) are also to be considered Professional criminals if their prime motive is capturing of property and money, and not against person; b) those who commit crimes of kidnapping of boys and girls for trade rather than exclusively for sexual motives are to be considered Professional criminals.

Therefore, for the specific purpose of this study, Professionals are considered to be those who commit crimes for apparent motives and intentions of unlawful gains of property or money with or without the use of violence. Non-professionals, on the other hand, commit violence (murder, hurt, etc.) without any apparent motives and intentions of unlawful gains of property and money.

In case of those criminal subjects who had committed illegal acts in the past, the nature of their previous criminal act was also taken into consideration while judging them as "Professional" or "Non-professional". Thus, a recidivist was judged twice on the variable of 'Type of Crime', once for the latest offense and once for the previous (2nd last) offense.

(b) Past Criminal Record

Generally, it is quite important to consider whether or not a particular individual is persisting in criminal career or he is just a 'one time loser'. In fact, the problem of recidivism is one of the main problems in criminality or criminology. Sutherland and Cressey (1978) observe that a large proportion of crimes committed can be attributed to repeaters. This clearly implies that a large part of the work of police, courts, and penal institutions must be devoted to recidivists. Persistence in criminality has been explained by many researchers and theorists. Sutherland and Cressey (1978) observe that group (or gang) membership, once developed through

"differential association", explains consistency in criminal behaviour. Aker's (1985) Differential Association - Reinforcement theory explains how the behaviour is socially learned and then maintained. Persistence in criminal behaviour has also been explained as due to the personality traits such as mental defectiveness, emotional instability, mental conflicts, egocentricism and psychosis (see, for example, Thompson, 1962), though evidence also shows that such personality factors lead individuals to violence against person more often than towards property crimes.

In the present research, Past Criminal Record has been conceived to be a significant characteristic of a Professional criminal. However, this has been seen in relation to the type of criminal acts committed in the past. The conjecture here is that a Professional is that criminal who repeatedly commits property offenses. Therefore, a subject is judged to be a Professional if (a) he has Past Criminal Record, (one criminal act at least) and (b) his past crime is against property, i.e. it was committed for apparent motives and intentions for unlawful gains of money and property.

A Non-professional usually does not have Past Criminal Record. At times, however, he may report previous arrests and convictions but a careful analysis of his encounter with law enforcing agencies may reveal a Non-professional pattern. This is so because like his present offense, his previous offenses, if any, may have been committed in interactional situations due to interpersonal conflicts, disputes, etc. and without any apparent motives for unlawful gains of money and property. In the present research, a subject was judged to be a Non-professional criminal if (a) he has no Past Criminal Record, or (b) he has Past Criminal Record, but his past criminal acts were not committed for unlawful gains of money and property.

About those offenders whose past criminal activity is not known or those who have committed their first ever offense, it is very difficult to say who among them will repeat his crime. One may take some years of experience and contact with law

enforcing agencies and may serve some sentences before he could become 'Professional' in the sense of the word employed in the present research.

(c) Relationship with the Victim

An analysis of interpersonal context in which crime takes place gives revealing information. For example, a murder may take place in a highway robbery which will be characteristically different from the one committed in an interactional situation having a dispute on, say, land, money or woman. Other meaningful information available from an indepth analysis of interpersonal context seems to be the relationship the offender has with the victim, etc., and whether the crime is committed alone or with accomplices. The most objectively definable is perhaps the Relationship with the Victim. Only three dimensions were considered in this regard in the present search: (a) whether the subject (offender) is known to the victim; (b) not known to him, or (c) the crime was a victimless crime as there was no person involved in the incident as a victim.

Professional criminals like thieves, robbers, pick-pockets, etc., are likely to commit their crimes in non-personal situations and their victims are usually strangers from outside their personal spheres of social interaction. Or they may be committing mostly victimless crimes. On the contrary, a Non-professional is likely to commit crimes on interpersonal conflicts in various interactional situations and his victims are usually known to him.

In the present research, a subject was considered Professional, if (a) victim was not known to the offender or (b) victimless crime was committed with an intention of unlawful property and monetary gains (e.g. smuggling, but not army desertion). A subject was judged as Non-professional if (a) victim was known to the offender, or (b)

Victimless crime was committed but not with intentions of unlawful property or monetary gains (e.g., army desertion).

(d) Premeditation

A Professional criminal is likely to commit premeditated crimes with planning and he usually carefully executes them. On the contrary, a Non-professional usually commits crime on the spur of a moment without premeditation or/and planning. However, exceptions can be observed when a Non-professional criminal also commits a crime with planning or/and premeditation. This particularly happens when he commits a crime on the pressure of social values such as revenge, saving the honour, and 'cleansing' the shame, etc. (Kanwar, 1989, Tariq & Durrani, 1983).

In the present research, effort was made to ascertain, through a careful analysis of each subject's account of his criminal act, whether or not a particular offense was carried out with premeditation and planning. A subject was considered to be a Professional, if he committed premeditated crime with intentions of unlawful property or monetary gains (e.g. theft but not murder even if planned but committed not for unlawful monetary or property gains). A subject was considered 'Non-professional' if he committed crime in an interactional situation without any planning or/and premeditation. A subject who committed crime with planning but without any motivations/intentions of unlawful monetary or property gains was also considered "Non-professional".

(e) Criminal Associations

Research evidence shows that an individual might learn criminal ways of life from his parents or/and friends outside the home (see, for example, Akers, 1985;

Sutherland and Cressey, 1978). In the present study, criminalistic parents, guardians, peers and associations with those who themselves practiced criminal ways of life were explored through many direct and indirect questions. It was deemed that the subject had Criminal Associations, if (a) he reports that from his parents, close relatives, and friends some had criminal records, i.e., arrests, trials, and convictions; or (b) he reports that in boyhood and adulthood, he was associated, somehow or the other, with some persons who were known to be delinquents and/or criminal persons. In the present research, a subject was judged to be a Professional criminal if he had associations with those who themselves practiced criminal ways of life for unlawful property or monetary gains. Whereas he was considered to be a Non-professional if he had no such associations.

FOLK CONCEPT OF A PAKISTANI PROFESSIONAL CRIMINAL

Researcher's conceptualization of a Professional criminal and the way this has been differentiated from a Non-professional criminal is based on a number of variables described above. The present researcher contends that this conception of a Professional criminal is held by the society as well. To elicit support for this contention, the layman's concept of a Professional criminal is investigated.

It may be observed here that previously crime was often seen in a global theoretical perspective and it was usually asserted that different types could be explained with the help of unitary explanations. However, it has now been exceedingly realized that explanations of criminal behaviour are complex and multi-dimensional (see, for example, Hollin & Howells, 1987; Gibbons & Jone, 1975; Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985). The recent findings tend to suggest that lay explanations for crime are not unitary, rather these vary according to the perception of the offender and the type of crime he commits. For example, Hollin and Howells (1987) observe that there exist specific attitudes of lay public towards individual crimes such as murder and hurt,

property offenses, and sexual offenses. They conclude their research on lay explanations of delinquency with the observation that "...the lay public does differentiate by type of crime when explaining offending" (p. 210). Gibbons (1985) observes that the idea that there are different types of criminals in a given society is, in fact, in the culture, because lay persons do perceive, believe and speak about a "criminal class" of different shades and varieties.

In the present research, the layman's concept of a Professional criminal has been explored. Specifically, it is investigated whether there are perceived differences among criminals who commit different types of crimes such as violence, property offenses and crimes of sexual nature. This is studied in the present research by way of comparing the researcher's conceptualization of a Professional criminal with that of the layman's perception of a Professional criminal. The assumption is that both the researcher's conceptualization and layman's perceptions of a Professional criminal are based on the five Classifying Variables described in the previous section. These variables are employed to sort convicted prisoners in two groups, namely Professional and Non-professional criminals. However, the two groups thus elicited are further hypothesized to differ from each other on a number of social-psychological attributes as well. In the following, the rationale of these hypothesized differences and the operational definitions of the variables involved are given.

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Demographic Variables include Venue of Crime, Age at the Commission of First Offense, Educational Level, Socio-economic Status, Marital Status at the commission of first offense, and Occupational Life Pattern. These have been selected on the basis of the rationale given below.

(a) Venue of Crime

The majority of the Pakistani population lives in the rural or semi-rural areas of the country and therefore, most crimes take place in the rural areas (Auolakh, 1986). However, the high rate of property offenses in urban areas are found almost in every society because of such reasons as impersonal relationships, lack of fair and equal opportunities or other concomitants of urbanization (Gibbons, 1987). Moreover, the property offenders find urban localities more conducive and rewarding for the type of criminal activities they engage in. As our Professional criminals are conceived to be committing mostly property crimes, it is likely that they more frequently commit their crimes in urban areas as compared to the Non-professionals. This has been tested in the present research. The information on the Demographic Variables including the Venue where the criminal act was committed, was obtained mainly from the subjects. However, venue of crime was also determined from the official records regarding the police station where First Information Report (FIR) was filed. The specific hypothesis tested was: Professional criminals will report having committed their crimes in Urban localities more frequently than Non-professional criminals.

(b) Age

Statistics on age of the offenders and criminality in the United States suggest that more than 50% of the total crimes (during 1984) were committed by individuals under 25 years of age, and that more than 50% of the individuals under 25 years were involved usually in different property crimes (Gibbons, 1987, p. 86). Compared with property offenders, the committers of violent crimes were relatively older. Greenberg (1985) also has shown that life period at which transition between adolescence and adulthood takes place is the age (15–19 years) when involvement in property crimes like larceny etc. begins to peak, whereas, in case of crimes against person like aggravated assault, etc., such a peak takes place later (30–34 years). The evidence also

suggests that early the involvement in delinquency or crime, deeper, severer, and more continuing is the involvement in crime (see, for example, Mannheim & Wilkins, 1955; Sellin, 1958; Wolfgang, Figlio, & Sellin, 1972).

In the context of the conceptualization of the present research, it may be contended that this is our Professional group of criminals in whose case the onset of criminality could be taking place early, and these may be the individuals who persist in criminal ways of life. This may not apply to the criminals who have been conceptualized as Non-professionals, because their involvement in crimes they usually commit, like murdering or hurting someone in an interpersonal situation, may happen any time in their lives as an unfortunate predicament. Therefore, age has been included as a demographical variable which may differentiate between the two proposed categories of criminals, Professionals and Non-professionals. Age of the subjects was obtained from the official records. The specific hypothesis tested is that Professional criminals' mean age will be less than that of the Non-professionals at the time of commission of their first offense.

(c) Socio-economic Status

Most of the researches carried out in the Western World indicate that crime does appear concentrated in areas of low income and low social status (Burt, 1944; Glueck & Glueck, 1934; Healy, 1915; Healy and Bronner, 1926; Reckless, 1961; Taft and England, 1964). These studies also reveal that among the population of convicts, most frequently are found those who belong to low socio-economic classes. Despite this observation most of these studies concluded that poverty in itself can not be called the prime condition leading to delinquency and crime, as the crime in the affluent groups is equally frequent. White-collar criminals, in whose case the seriousness of crime can not be underrated by any criterion whatsoever, belong to high socio-economic classes and most of them may also be highly educated. Hence it would be erroneous to

argue that all criminality stems from destitute and poverty. It seems that the criminals belonging to low strata of the society are more likely to be detected, arrested, tried in the court and then retained in the prisons.

As the present research employs convicts as subjects, it is quite likely that most of them would belong to low socio-economic strata. Still, some differences between the SES of two groups of criminals studied may be observed. Professionals have been conceptualized to commit mostly property crimes, and it has been also assumed that they would be indulging in such crimes repeatedly starting their activities at early age. Furthermore, their involvement in such criminal activities has also been partially attributed to lower educational levels and chequered occupational patterns in early part of their lives. Therefore, it seems plausible to assume that such criminals would be having quite a low SES level. However, the Non-professionals on the other hand, have not been conceived so on the SES related variables, namely Age and Occupational Life Pattern. The very nature of the crimes they usually commit, i.e., murder, assault, etc. suggests that they might belong to any age group or might have any SES. Though, one does not expect that subjects belonging to higher levels of SES will be found in this study, yet it is quite likely that for reasons noted above they may manifest somewhat higher SES than Professional criminals. Therefore, the demographic variable of SES has been included in the present research as one of the discriminating variables between the two proposed categories of criminals. Socio-economic status was ascertained by asking questions about the monthly income of the family. If it was a joint family, the total income of the family members (mostly sons and father) was recorded. This was categorized into three groups: Rs. 2000 and below, between Rs. 2000 and Rs. 4000, and between Rs. 4000 and Rs. 6,000. On the basis of this information each subject was judged to belong to low, low–middle, or middle socio-economic status. The specific hypothesis tested is that Professional criminals will come more frequently from low socio-economic strata of the society compared with Non-professional criminals.

(d) Education

The variable of education has been included in the present research as a differentiating variable between the two proposed groups of criminals on more or less same grounds for which the socio-economic status has been studied. It is assumed that educational level of the Professionals would be lower than the Non-professional criminals. The information regarding the educational level was obtained from the subjects in terms of the number of years they attended an educational institution. The specific hypothesis tested is that Professional criminals will report having received less number of years of schooling compared with Non-Professional criminals.

(e) Marital Status

Professional criminals who engage in criminality on a regular basis could be usually the drifters in life without any feeling of affiliation and belongingness. The researchers have discovered that being married and having children are deterrent to crime (Schafer, 1976; Sutherland & Cressy, 1955). This could be because of the reason that home consisting of wife and children may not only provide emotional support in moments of despair and frustration, it might as well prevent individuals from adopting criminal ways of life which are full of risks and uncertainties. Therefore, it may be plausible to contend that those who adopt criminal way of life, i.e., indulge in property offenses somewhat regularly are more frequently those who lack sense of affiliation to a home where they have a family and children. But Professional criminals could be more frequently found to be unmarried for altogether different reasons too. As such individuals are hypothesized to enter into criminality at a relatively young age, it might become exceedingly difficult for these persons to get married for being socially undesirable for most women and their parents in the society. Non-professionals, on the other hand, are assumed to commit mostly violent

crimes, at relatively older age levels. Furthermore, they usually do not have a criminal history which could make it difficult for them to get married.

Considering above, the variable of marital status might differentiate between the two categories of criminals, namely Professionals and Non-professionals. Marital status at the time of commission of subject's first offense was reported by the subject as "married" or "not married". The specific hypothesis tested is that Professional criminals will be more frequently unmarried at the time of commission of their first offense compared with the Non-Professional criminals.

(f) Occupational Life Pattern

Professional criminals in this study are conceived to be committing mostly property crimes. They are also hypothesized to be starting their criminal activities earlier in life. It is further assumed that most of them might be having a chequered occupational history. Firstly, they might be predominantly those who because of their low educational levels and low socio-economic status, may be facing greater difficulties in receiving any occupational skill or training and subsequently a job. Once the individual starts getting some monetary or other gains through illegal activities, the reinforcement may be so strong that it may further reduce the chances of an individual adopting any fair and legal ways of earning. The individual's interests, motivation and efforts for a lawful occupation in the society may further diminish and his efforts may slacken further. Therefore, it is hypothesized that a Professional criminal's occupational pattern in life may be quite disturbed and chequered.

The questions regarding subject's Occupational Life Pattern were posed in such a way that it could reveal (i) whether or not the person was trained for any vocation after completion of his early education or/and after having reached about 16 years of

age; (ii) whether the person held a job for more than 3 years consecutively; (iii) in case of being non-employed, did he seriously try to employ himself gainfully in a lawful activity. If the answers to all these questions were in affirmative, then the occupational pattern was considered to be 'normal', but if these were in negative, then it was judged to be 'chequered'. The specific hypothesis tested is that Professional criminals will report having had a more chequered Occupation Life Pattern than Non-professional criminals.

In all, six hypotheses regarding the Demographic Variables have been tested. These are listed below:

- (1) Professional criminals will report having committed their crimes in urban localities more frequently than Non-professional criminals.
- (2) Professional criminals' mean age will be less than that of the Non-professionals at the time of the commission of their first offense.
- (3) Professional criminal will come more frequently from low socio-economic strata of the society as compared to Non-professional criminals.
- (4) Professional criminals will report having received less number of years of schooling as compared to Non-professional criminals.
- (5) Professional criminals will be more frequently unmarried at the time of commission of their first offense as compared to the Non-professional criminals.
- (6) Professional criminals will report having had a more chequered Occupational Life Pattern than Non-professional criminals.

EARLY HOME ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

We have seen above how Professional and Non-professional criminals are likely to differ from each other on certain Demographic Variables like Venue of Crime, Age, Socio-economic Status, Educational Level, Marital Status, and Occupational Life Pattern. In this section we will see how these two types of criminals may be different from each other as regards the conditions prevailing in their homes during their childhood and adolescent period of their lives.

In fact early family life and its influence on child behaviour and personality are quite important in development of all social behaviour. Most psychologists and sociologists seem to be in agreement on the importance of early experiences of the child in home situation. Thompson (1962), for example, stressed the effects of parental behaviour on children's psychological growth and development. He observed that the foundation of children's social attitudes and skills were laid in the home and the child's psychological adjustment in adult life were dependent on the nature of parent-child relationships. Therefore, family environmental variables have always been considered important in studies on delinquency and crime (see, for example, Bell, 1968; Hanson, Henggeler, Haeefele & Rodick, 1984; Henggeler, 1982; Rockwell, 1978; West & Farrington, 1973, 1977). Intra-family experiences of delinquents and criminals have been studied intensively and assigned a crucial etiological role in the development of anti-social behaviour. Particularly, the influence of certain adverse psychological conditions prevailing at home during childhood have been considered to be most important. Some studies, for example, concluded that the delinquents had about twice the proportion of broken homes as did children in general population (Glueck & Glueck, 1951; Sutherland & Cressey, 1955) that the delinquents come from homes replete with tension, uncongeniality, and marital maladjustment between parents and psychological disruption of diverse nature (see, for example, Alexander, 1973; Buikhuisen & Meijjs, 1983; Cortes & Gatti, 1972; Gove & Crutchfield, 1982;

Goppinger, 1987; Thompson, 1962); and that the defective modes of discipline administered by parents in childhood and early adolescence could cause the development of delinquent tendencies in young boys (see, for example, Andry, 1960; Faunce & Riskin, 1970; Ferreira & Winter, 1968; Hetherington, Stouwie, & Ridberg, 1971; Hirschi, 1969; McCord, 1979; Riskin & Faunce, 1970b; Wilson, 1980).

In the present study, it will be seen how certain adverse psychological conditions, traditionally included in most studies on criminal behaviour, could relate to the two types of criminals identified on the basis of the offense and offender related variables. The assumption is that Professional criminals are likely to be exposed to psychological adversity of certain forms prevailing in the home during their early childhood and adolescence.

Another assumption of this study is that any set of psychologically adverse conditions alone may not explain all criminal behaviour. Many forms of criminal acts are committed by those who have non-pathological personalities or at least whose personalities remain free from the alleged baleful influences of certain psychologically adverse conditions. Their criminal acts warrant a socio-cultural explanation. The Non-professional subjects as conceptualized in this study are the examples of such criminals.

Three variables namely Physically Broken Home, Psychologically Disrupted Home and Defective Modes of Discipline called Early Home Environmental Conditions are included in the present work. On the basis of these variables Psychological Adversity Scores have also been derived. Following are given the operational definitions of these variables.

(a) Physically Broken Home

In a physically broken home, individual does not live with both the parents, whereas in a physically intact or 'not-broken' home he lives with both the parents for most of the time during first eighteen years of his life. There could be many reasons for the break in the family or home. In the study, death of one or both parents, divorce, separation, desertion, imprisonment, and employment of the parent(s) away from home, are taken into account.

(b) Psychologically Disrupted Home

It is deemed that the home is psychologically disrupted if the subject reports (and the analysis of his report yields), that the parents lacked harmony and accord among themselves as evidenced by (i) obvious disliking for each other, (ii) harsh and inconsiderate treatment of one by the other, or and (iii) frequent quarrels, fights and brawls among themselves, etc. A home is considered to be a psychologically 'not-disrupted home' if the subject reports (and the analysis of his report yields) that there is harmony and accord among parents, that they are considerate to each other and that they are, most of the time, living compatibly with each other.

(c) Defective Modes of Discipline

We noted above that many researches have indicated that some amount of discipline and affection are necessary for the healthy development of the child. In the present study it has been premised that defective modes of discipline, i.e., the defective nature of administration of control and support to the child by parents would produce psychological disruption for the child and may lead to development of anti-social and anti-law tendencies in him. The most of the studies referred to above also revealed

that unsound discipline, for example, either extremely lax or extremely strict or rigid control, may lead to deviant and criminal behaviour.

Therefore, in the present study, Modes of Discipline are studied in terms of control and support combinations. It is assumed that, in their extreme forms, three combinations of these modes of discipline, namely, High Control-Low Support, Low Control-Low Support, and High Support-Low Control, would tend to produce psychological disruptions in the home for the child and may make him prone to illegal and anti-social behaviour (for a detailed theoretical account, see Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Cortes & Gatti, 1972).

These variables were measured from the subject's view-point, "the Control" and "the Support" he thought he received from his parents and what he could report in this connection. His responses were clinically analyzed to reach at the conclusion whether he received high, normal, or low control, and whether he received high, normal or low support. To measure the variables of control and support, such questions were constructed the responses to which could reflect the following levels of combinations of Control and Support.

Levels of Control: (a) High Control, i.e. disciplinary control but very rigid, hard, and punitive, and in its extreme form; (b) Normal Control, i.e., supervisory and custodial control in its balanced form; (c) Low Control, i.e., lax, extremely permissive control which amounts to indifference by the parents.

Levels of Support: (a) High support, i.e., Pampering, over-protecting and extreme permissiveness. Also those behaviour patterns of the parents which are likely to fail in imparting in the child a sense of responsibility and a regard to social norms and values; (b) Normal Support, i.e., affection, love and care along with training of the child to impart in the child autonomy, a sense of responsibility and trustworthiness;

(c) Low Support, i.e., rejection, disapproval, and an obvious preference to other siblings.

Following support control combinations were; deemed defective: (1) High Support-High Control, (2) High Support-Low Control, (3) Low Support-High Control, and (4) Low-Support-Low Control.

All other combinations were deemed 'not defective'.

The specific hypotheses related to the Early Home Environmental Conditions are as the following:

- (1) Professional criminals will report belonging to Physically Broken Homes more frequently than Non-professional criminals.
- (2) Professional criminals will report belonging to Psychological Disrupted Homes more frequently than Non-professional criminals.
- (3) Professional criminals will report having received Defective Modes of Discipline from their parents more frequently than Non-professional criminals.
- (4) Professional criminals will score higher on the Psychological Adversity Scale than Non-professional criminals.

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

Psychologists' efforts to identify peculiar personality characteristics among criminals have been based on the assumption that there are consistent personality

characteristics which pervasively influence and give consistency to an individual behaviour pattern or mode of conduct as well as making its prediction possible across many situations (Mischel, 1973). This implies that people differ from one another in many personality characteristics and behavioural dispositions: some are aggressive or assertive while others are submissive; some are adventurous and out-going while others are shy or conservative. In other words, it is due to the broad underlying disposition to respond differently from others, that individuals have dissimilar attitudinal and behavioural pattern. Lillyquist (1980) postulates that these are differential (cognitive) dispositions which shape attitudes of certain persons and make "— it easier to engage in a criminal act" (p.5).

Many psychologists-criminologists studying crime, therefore, assumed that they could identify personality traits or variables which are related to criminal behaviour. Presumably, they thought it was predictable which individual was most likely to engage in criminal behaviour only on the basis of judging personality traits. Another assumption in this line of argument was that personality of different types of criminals would be different: murderers, rapists, burglars and swindlers all differing with each other on certain personality traits. Some broad empirically derived differences among various offenders have been found and described in terms of statistical probability that certain demographic and background variables and personality characteristics are observed among offenders like thieves, rapists, certain types of killers, and so on and so forth.

The use of personality tests with offenders and non-offenders to measure hypothesized differences between them has been very common. A great deal of data on psychogenic hypothesis, for example, are produced by studies which used Rorschach and Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), and other personality tests. However, Glueck and Glueck's (1951) classic studies on delinquents and controls using psychiatric interviews and Rorschach tests to measure basic personality traits

produced mixed results: differences between offenders and non-offenders were not very pronounced; some of the findings went against the thesis that delinquency is a form of neurotic and acting-out behaviour. The studies employing MMPI to differentiate between personality profiles of offenders and non-offender are many. For examples, Hathaway and Monachesi (1953, 1963) conducted a series of studies which showed that delinquents were somewhat higher on Pd (Psychopathic deviate) scale than non-delinquents, the former group also being more often uncooperative, and they more frequently lied too. Other researchers came out with similar findings. However, the critics of these investigations (e.g., Fisher, 1962; Schrag, 1954) pointed out problems of interpretation of MMPI results, and observed that a number of social factors correlated more highly with delinquency than do MMPI scores. Some critics concluded that MMPI was fundamentally inappropriate in study of deviant roles. They argued that for the study of criminal and other such behaviours, role-specific patterns of social-psychological nature should be investigated.

Jesness Inventory (Jesness & Wedge, 1984) has been used in a number of studies to demonstrate differences between delinquents and non-delinquents. Usually, the differences on four scales were significant which showed that delinquents were hostile towards authority, suspicious and distrustful of others, immature and more frequently tended to deny that they had problems.

Conger and Miller's (1966) study, using retrospective data and consisting mainly of teachers' ratings, found out that offenders more frequently had problems of adjustment as early as the third grade. At the time of study, data on certain personality tests revealed that they were more immature, egocentric, impulsive, inconsiderate and hostile than the non-delinquents

Offenders have also been differentiated from non-offenders on the basis of Interpersonal Maturity Levels (I-Levels) system developed in the juvenile correction

system in California (for a critical comment, see Gibbons, 1981). The seven level of maturity, in fact, indicate the extent of socialization a person has achieved in life with special orientation to his interpersonal relationships in the society. The system claims not only to differentiate between delinquents and non-delinquents, but also to discriminate various types within the delinquent population.

In short, personality characteristics explored in various previous studies included aggression, extraversion-introversion, anxiety, self-esteem, locus of control, and many other similar constructs related to the personality dynamics of criminals. In the present study three of such characteristics namely Socialization Level, Self-esteem, and Acting-out (Aggression) have been investigated with the assumption that important differences might exist between Professional and Non-professional criminals as conceptualized in this research. In the following, the rationale of studying each of these personality characteristics is given.

(a) Socialization

Researchers have proposed that some criminal behaviour is the result of mental pathology known as psychopathic or sociopathic personality which characterizes such personality traits as egocentricity (inability to see other's point of view) antisocial behaviour, insensitivity to others' feelings and sufferings, hostility, impulsiveness, and projection of blame on others (Cleckly, 1976; Gough, 1960). Such persons are believed to be not suffering from any mental disorder, rather their behaviour is considered to be the outcome of the defects of family relationships which produce a poorly socialized, indifferent, and uncooperative person who can 'easily' (without fear or remorse) indulge in immoral, or/and antisocial activities (see, for example, McCord & McCord, 1956). However, the findings of Robin's (1966) longitudinal study of "sociopaths" led her to believe that some kind of personality entity seems to exist which produces sociopathic behaviour.

The empirical verification of psychopathic personality as related to various behavioural patterns including criminality seems difficult because of the diversification in definitional attributes of a psychopathic personality outlined by various researchers. The relationship with criminality is also not proven yet (see, for example, Sutherland & Cressey, 1978). Moreover, critics remain highly sceptical of the concept of psychopath or a sociopath. Gibbons (1987) has criticized the concept of 'criminal mind' or 'criminal personality which is akin to sociopath personality' on the grounds that most researches supporting such a concept have generalized from a typical clinical populations of insane offenders rather than from that of the garden variety of common offenders. He also observes:

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that psychopathy or sociopathy has often been a pejorative label hung upon certain lawbreakers because of their non-conformist behaviour rather than a psychiatric diagnosis pointing to some kind of psychological impairment on their part. Stated another way, these terms have been used tautologically: Individuals have been identified as psychopaths or sociopaths because of their involvement in criminality, drug addiction or some other troublesome behaviour, and 'explanations', that account for the behaviour on the basis of psychopathy have followed (p. 167).

Gough's (1960) conceptualization of sociopathic personality is not only different from others but also quite fruitful. It encompasses the criminal behaviour at a large scale rather than explaining only a relatively few or specific forms of criminality and that also mainly of clinical interest. Gough (1948) initially developed a role-taking theory to account for the attitudes and characteristics of the psychopath who is not able to see himself or herself as an object or understand another's point of view, or even experience social emotions such as embarrassment, contrition, identification or loyalty. Apparently, a criminal having these characteristics may look asocial because

"he or she does not play the social game by the conventional rules. He or she is a "lone wolf", not a "team player" (Gibbons, 1987, p. 168).

However, Goughs' (1960) most fruitful contribution is to conceptualize psychopathy as a continuum of socialization, representing best citizens at one end, and asocial at the other. These differences were conceptualized to be differences in individuals' ability of role-taking. Gough argued that asocial individuals would tend to be criminals, deviants, and generally antisocial whereas well-socialized persons would occupy positions of trust and repute. The Socialization (So) scale Gough developed to investigate his theory is one of the scales of his California Personality Inventory and has been widely used in differentiating criminals from non-criminals. In the present research, the selection of Socialization dimension of the personality and the decision to study the same with So scale of CPI have been based on the following:

- (a) The adverse home environmental conditions (as studied in the present research and hypothesized to be differentially related to two types of criminals) may affect the socialization process of an individual adversely and the result may be a faulty socialization which may manifest itself through problems of social behaviour including antisocial behaviour. Therefore, Socialization as a personality variable, may show an important difference between different types of criminals. It may be interesting to note that where poor socialization may lead to criminal and other forms of deviant behaviour, criminal behaviour in itself may affect the socialization adversely. In other words a Professional criminal may become so in life because he 'had' a low level of Socialization and then by virtue of being a Professional criminal, his socialization may continue to remain faulty or even become worse.

- (b) The So (Socialization) scale has been translated into many languages and has been frequently administered to delinquents and criminals in a number of countries. For example, studies have compared military offenders with military non-offenders, (or with published norms) and found the offenders to have significantly lower So scores (Datel, 1962). Other studies show that the So scale can reflect different levels of Socialization within samples of offenders (see for example, Peterson, Quay & Anderson (1959) found recidivists to have lower So scores than first offenders. Two studies (Megargee 1964; Wilcock, 1964) comparing assaultive and non-assaultive criminals have reported higher So scores among the more violent offenders. The way types of criminals have been conceptualized in the present work, the scale seems quite an appropriate measure of showing differences at least between the two broad types, namely Professional and Non-professional criminals.
- (c) As described above, Gough's original goal, in fact, was to construct a delinquency scale based upon his role-taking theory of sociopathy (Gough & Peterson, 1952). Subsequent research indicated that the scale reflected not only the delinquency but a full ranges of Socialization also, as Gough later indicated that the scale reflects the degree of social maturity, integrity and the rectitude an individual has attained. It orders individuals along a continuum from social to anti-social and asocial behaviour and forecasts the likelihood that they will transgress the mores established by their particular cultures (Gough, 1965). Using this scale to measure 'Socialization' levels of our criminal subjects most of whom are likely to fall into normal (Non-professional) and anti-social (Professional) categories may be quite promising, particularly with the hypothesis that Professional criminals will score low on the scale.

- (d) As regards the validity studies, Gough (1960) quotes Socialization scores of different samples ranging from the scores of 'best citizen' and other normal populations and the scores obtained by subjects like Prisoners and other deviant groups. There are observed significant differences between these groups. These differences between offenders and non-offenders have been established in other research studies as well (see, for example, Reckless, Diniz, & Kay, 1957; Reckless, Diniz & Murray, 1957). Gibbon's (1987) remarks on the So scale as follows:

"...Gough's techniques have much promise for the study of personality problems and criminality. One major implication of Gough's work is that the search for personality variations will only succeed in so far as the measuring instruments are specifically related to some explicit hypothesis under investigation" (p. 169).

- (e) An adaptation of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) was undertaken by Ahmed (1986) in Pakistan. Since then the selected scales from Urdu adapted version have been recently used in some studies (see, for example, Ashfaq, 1987, Altaf, 1988). It has been reported by Ahmed (1986) that Urdu version is sufficiently similar to the English version. The KR-20 indices of reliability of the scales range from 0.44 to 0.93 with a median value of 0.68 which is fairly satisfactory. Gough (1960) quotes test-retest reliability as the following: 0.69 (high school females), 0.65 (high school males) and 0.80 (prison mates). In the reliability study, 200 male prisoners took the test twice with a lapse from 7 to 21 days between testings. In this study, questions were read aloud to half the subjects on the first administration and they read questions silently to themselves the second time; for the other half, the procedure was reversed. No measurable differences resulted from the oral administration. Gough (1960)

observes that the correlations in the prisoner group are as high as those generally found in personality measurement.

The specific hypothesis tested regarding the Socialization levels is that Professional criminals will score lower on Socialization scale of CPI than Non-professional criminals.

(b) Self-esteem

There are many aspects in which Self-esteem can also relate to the development of criminality. Gibbons (1968) while propounding the role-career theory of criminality and a typology of adult criminals associated with it, emphasized the role-related self-images of the offenders. He discriminated between two basic components of offender roles: behavioural acts and conceptions or self-images and attitudes". He postulated that offender types, along with having criminal behaviour, do have criminal self-images and attitudes such as considering himself being "tough" and viewing others as "mean" and not to be trusted, etc.

However, the construct of Self-esteem is being employed in the present research not as a criminal-role-specific characteristic but as a general personality trait which the other researchers have shown to be closely related with the deviant behaviour (research references follow shortly).

Positive Self-esteem may manifest itself in honesty, integrity, uprightness, and even in pro-social behaviour. Negative or low Self-esteem may lead not only to anxiety, frustration, despair but also to mistrust, distrust, vengeance, and hatred (see Branden, 1990). An individual who has an inadequate or negative Self-esteem may indulge in immoral or illegal activities as a reaction to his sense of inadequacy, and as Branden (1990) observes, "...in his eagerness to provide more lavish demonstrations

of his mastery, he commits more flagrant offenses still, telling himself that he is beyond good and evil, as if challenging the fate to bring him down" (p. 7).

In fact, the experience of self-respect which is an essential component of Self-esteem, makes possible a benevolent, non-neurotic sense of relationship with other individuals. It imparts mutual regard and respect for others' rights. Negative Self-esteem may lead to alienation and estrangement from the society, or giving disregard to others' needs, desires and comforts and even depriving them of their fair rights. This could be partly because in a mindless effort to gain security and material for themselves, those having low or negative Self-esteem may damage, hurt and kill others. Deviants like heroin addicts, delinquents and criminals have been shown to have low levels of psychologically positive and desirable traits compared with non-deviants. (see, for example, Deleon, Skodal, & Rosenthal, 1973; Haddox & Jacobson, 1972; Kilman, 1974; Korin, 1974; Platt, 1975; Sheppard, Ricca, Fracchia, Merlls, 1974; Sutker, Archer, & Allain, 1978).

Similarly, Self-esteem disturbances have been shown to manifest themselves in other negative aspects of personality related to social and emotional domains (Astin, 1959). Manganiello (1978) used Tennessee Self-Concept Scale with 60 juvenile delinquents and heroin addicts and found them to have a significantly low self-concept as compared to the control group. O'Mahony and Smith (1984) studied the self-concept of addicted prisoners, non-addict prisoners, and a group of normal subjects all within the age range of 17–20 years. Analysis of variance indicated that addicts and non-addicts did not differ as significantly as addict prisoners different from non-addict prisoners and non-addict non-prisoners. Even non-addict prisoners had low Self-esteem as compared to non-addict non-prisoners.

There is not available any study done in Pakistan which could have explored the Self-esteem of offender groups. However, a few studies conducted in India (the country having some cultural and socio-economic affinities to share with Pakistan) reveal that criminals have low Self-esteem compared with non-criminals (Sinha & Singh, 1968) and that anxiety, Self-esteem and neuroticism are inter-related personality characteristics (Qureshi & Akbar, 1979). Another study revealed that individuals with higher Self-esteem had a lower level of anxiety (Shahi & Thakur, 1977). A few studies conducted in the west have also shown this interrelationship between personality traits. For example, it has been shown that there is a negative correlation between positive self-concept and external locus of control (Friedberg, 1982; Sobhyavathi & Thomas, 1984). Choudhry and Malhotra (1988) who found out that criminals had a significantly higher anxiety score as compared to the Non-criminals also discovered them to be more self-conscious, guilt-prone, and suspicious than the Non-criminals. However, they failed to find any significant difference between criminals and non-criminals on Self-esteem and locus of control. Explaining this, Choudhry and Malhotra observe that those criminals who were convicted for the first time did feel 'inferior' and 'self conscious', but on Self-esteem measure they were not significantly different from the non-criminals. The further explanations given by them are only partially clear. They observe:

This may be explained in different ways. Disorientation could be one of the factors. The other possibility could be the differences in socialization experiences, family background and peer-group values of the two groups (of criminals and non-criminals) as the self is the product of the socio-cultural world of the individual and also the manner in which he incorporates that world to his perceptual system. It may be further conjectured that the individual who commits crime is perhaps a member of some criminal gang which gives support and reinforcement to the

person concerned. This is typical of criminals who opt for crime as profession (p. 77).

It is important to note in Choudhry and Malhotra's (1988) above quoted account that Professional criminals' self-concept may remain undamaged because of the subcultural support they receive from the gang they belong to. The present researcher contends that Professional criminals may drift to criminality due to low Self-esteem, but it is not likely that their Self-esteem would change to positivity merely because of the gang affiliations. A person may just try to achieve sense of worth and thus elevate his Self-esteem, but whether this is possible at the level of personality structure is open to question. One thing seems quite clear that the type of criminal may be a decisive factor in investigating relationship between criminality and low Self-esteem. Not many researches seem to have taken care of this. The present researcher contends that the type of crime a person has committed and the kind of criminal background he comes from could be a very important factor in relationship of Self-esteem to criminal behaviour.

On the above theoretical and empirical considerations, it was considered meaningful to investigate the Self-esteem of Pakistani prisoners, particularly with the hypotheses that Professional and Non-professional criminals as defined in the present study will show differences of Self-esteem, the former having lower Self-esteem than the latter. Professional criminals are likely to have lower Self-esteem because of the adversity they are assumed to have seen in their lives, and perhaps also because of the social-psychological factors due to which they usually fail to adopt a lawful, socially approved, and respectable profession in life. Non-professionals, on the other hand, are hypothesized to have higher Self-esteem because apart from other reasons, they are assumed to indulge in aggressive acts in interactional situation on issues which in most cases are perceived by them as threatening to their self-respect and honour,

The specific hypothesis tested is that the Professional criminals will score lower on Self-esteem scale of the Adjective Check-list than Non-professional criminals. However, the differences between Professional and Non-Professional criminals in terms of nine other scales derived from Murray (1965) are also explored (details are given shortly).

(c) Acting-out

Those criminals who indulge in violence against person may appear "bizarre, deviant, or unusual' compared with the property offenders (Gibbons, 1987; p. 256). However, leaving apart relatively small number of those who are professional killers and plan and use complex techniques to kill or assault, most violent acts are committed on the spur of the moment under unfavourable circumstances and in unhappy situations (see, for example, Wolfgang, 1958). In Pakistan as much as elsewhere, the murders and assaults are mostly the product of general social situations (Kanwar, 1989, Tariq & Durrani, 1983). The present researcher contends that relatively limited number of criminals exist whose violent criminal acts could be attributed to psychogenic factors. The nature of social factors, however, may vary from society to society. In United States, most violent acts may be taking place in cities where individuals who reside in certain urban neighbourhoods get involved in violence largely in response to the exacerbated tensions and disorder of their social situations (Gibbons, 1987, p. 264-65). In Pakistan on the other hand, most of murders and assaults take place in rural areas in interpersonal disputes and conflicts (Kanwar, 1989; Tariq & Durrani, 1983). But the research question is whether there exist certain personality differences between violent offenders, non-violent offenders or/and non-offenders. People more or less are equally exposed to allegedly tension-loaded situations and unhappy circumstances. Not all of them indulge into illegal acts. So, are there certain kinds of socialization experiences which produce "aggressive" individuals with "atypical" hostile psychological or/and behavioural dispositions?

There are many studies which show that murderers and assaultists tend to have higher degree of aggression, hostility and other such personality characteristics (see, for example, Berkowitz, 1983; Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mower, & Sears, 1939; Megargee, 1966d). Peterson, Pittman, and O'Neal (1962) found out that assaultive offenders had higher levels of generalized hostility than did the property criminals. It seems that those persons who respond to stress situations with high arousal, the aggressive behaviour is likely to occur. Bartol and Bartol (1986) observe:

High levels of arousal seem to facilitate (not cause) aggressive behaviour in certain situations. Extremely high arousals seems to interfere with our sense of self-awareness and internal control, rendering us more susceptible to environmental cues and to mindless or habitual behaviours. In this sense, under very high arousal, we may not stop to consider the consequences of our violent behaviour (p. 174).

Toch (1969) observes that most violent acts can be attributed to a 'disposition' which has been well-learned and which individuals adopt because these proved effective in dealing with conflictful interpersonal relationships. To Toch (1969), violence, thus, is not simply a rash act committed on the spur of moment in an impulsive manner. Rather, it is the act of one who has habitual response patterns of reacting violently. In other words, such persons have a consistent way of acting-out their impulses.

If the above theorization is correct, the murderers and assaultists, particularly the ones who happen to kill and hurt in interpersonal situations, may score high on measures of hostility, emotional arousal and aggression, etc. particularly acting-out behaviour, and low on self-control measures.

In the context of the present study, we may assume that habitual criminals defined as "Professionals" are likely to be "cool" and "calculating" individuals who usually commit predatory crimes such as theft, robbery, pick-pocketing, etc. On the other hand, are the Non-professional criminals who happen to assault and kill, mostly in interpersonal provocative conditions and situations which threaten an individuals' ego and honour. It could be further assumed here that such individuals become criminals in life only because they fail to control their impulses in a given moment and behave in a physically aggressive manner. In other words, such individuals may have a disposition in which overt aggression is the characteristic form of behaviour. Furthermore, it is quite likely that Non-professional criminals are different from the Professionals, latter committing mostly premeditated crimes with calculations about the risks involved, and hence may not be as overtly aggressive as the Non-professionals could be.

As regards the choice of a measure to tap aggression, hostility and the like behaviour, earlier research has shown that murderers present themselves, while tested in the prisons, as less hostile and aggressive in the face of their violent crimes. For example, Lang, Holden, Langevin, Pugh and Wu (1987) observe that "defensiveness may be the critical defining factor in their self report measures. Hostility, too, may be a critical personality dimension in their make-up, albeit they will not admit or accept it" (p. 180).

For this reason, in the present research instead of employing the traditional measures of aggression and hostility, a projective technique is used. Hand Test (Wagner, 1983) was selected to measure the acting-out (aggressive) behaviour of the criminals and non-criminal subjects.

Hand Test has been developed as a projective technique to measure and predict overt aggression through the acting out tendencies of the individuals. It is a diagnostic

technique which utilizes semi-ambiguous pictures of hand as the projective medium. Employing relatively structured stimuli (pictures of human hands) in relatively unstructured poses, the test indicates individual variations in responses yet restricting these responses to definable and classifiable categories, namely description of hand actions and attitudes. Since its inception, the Hand Test has been represented as an instrument which measures prototyped action tendencies, and dispositions which are "close to the surface" and apt to be expressed in overt behaviour (Wagner, 1983).

Different studies have shown the ability of the Hand test to discriminate between various normal and clinical groups. Hand Test responses of 90 college students, for example, provided a comparison of two groups of drug users and a control group (Wagner & Romanik, 1976). Significant differences were revealed on four Hand Test variables: Exhibition, Acquisition, Active, and Environmental. Hand Test variables have also been shown to significantly differentiate between groups of aggressive and non-aggressive alcoholics (Haramis & Wagner, 1980). The aggressive group showed significantly more Aggression responses and fewer Active responses, than the non-aggressive group (see also Bricklin, Piotrowski, & Wagner, 1962). Selg (cited in Wagner, 1983) found out that performance on the Acting-out Score of the Hand Test was a successful discriminator between two groups of aggressive and non-aggressive children (see Campos, 1968 also).

The Acting-out Score was also shown to differentiate between assaultive and non-assaultive delinquents (Wagner & Hawkins, 1964). A significant difference in the Acting-out Score was found with the assaultive group exhibiting a higher score. Additionally, the Acting-out Score alone correctly classified 78% of the delinquents as assaultive versus non-assaultive. A study by Wetsel, Shapiro, and Wagner (1967) looked at the differences in certain Hand Test variables for one-time losers and recidivists (juvenile delinquents) particularly on Aggression scores which showed

significant differences between the two groups. A study by Oswald and Loftus (1967) examined differences in responses for normal and delinquent children and discovered significant differences on variables of Affection, Aggression, Description, Failure, Total Responses, and Acting-out Scores (see also McGiboney & Huey, 1982). However, in a study by King (cited in Wagner, 1983), differences on the variables of Affection and Acting-out Score between aggressive and non-aggressive black adolescents were not found significant. In this study, aggressive examinees produced more withdrawal responses than did the non-aggressive examinees.

The research evidence shows that highly aggressive protocols on Hand Test are found for individuals who were imprisoned for their criminal acts and at times even acted out aggressively while incarcerated (Azcarate & Gutierrez, 1969; Porecki & Vandergoot, 1978). The relationship of the Acting-out Score to antisocial behaviour has also been studied using a group of adult prisoners by Brodsky and Brodsky (1967). Significant differences were found between person and property offenders, but not between the other group comparisons. The Hand Test variable of Communication was significantly higher for property versus person offenders, whereas person offenders produced more Tension and Crippled responses than property offenders or deserters. In addition, property offenders produced more Active and fewer Tension responses than deserters. Another study on incarcerated young men (age range 19 to 27 years) by McFarland (1979) came out with more or less same results: Incarcerated males produced less Affection and Failure responses compared with college students.

It may be noted that most of the previous studies employing Hand Test Variables to differentiate antisocial behaviour from normal behaviour have been conducted on children or adolescents. Studies on adult offenders are few. The present study is on adult criminals and aims not only at exploring differences between types of criminals, but also between criminals and non-criminals.

The specific hypothesis tested as regards the Acting-out scores is as follows: Non-professional criminals will score higher on AOS (Acting-out Scores) dimensions of the Hand Test than Professional criminals. However, following additional analyses were also carried out:

- (a) Professional and Non-professional criminals were compared with each other on various dimensions of the Hand Test in addition to Acting-out scores assuming that there might exist differential comparisons which would generate further hypotheses.
- (b) The results (reported in chapter 4) of comparisons between Professional and Non-professional criminals revealed that no significant differences were observed between two types of criminals on various Hand Test Variables including Acting-out Scores (AOS). Therefore, it was considered worth obtaining the scores of a comparable random sample of 60 non-criminals and compare these scores with those of criminals on different dimensions of the Hand Test.

In all, three hypotheses related to Personality characteristics were formulated and tested in the present research. These are listed below:

1. Professional criminals will score lower on Socialization scale of CPI than Non-professional criminals.
2. Professional criminals will score lower on Self-esteem scale of the Adjective Check-list than Non-professional criminals.
3. Non-professional criminals will score higher on AOS (Acting-out Scores) dimension of the Hand Test than Professional criminals.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

SAMPLES

The most pressing problem in a research on crime is to define its subjects. In fact, there has been a great deal of controversy about the proper subjects of research in the field of criminality. However, to study a sample of true offenders from the total population, the conviction and sentence by a court of law seems to be the only criterion which, though far from ideal, is somewhat objective. It is true that a criminal is one who violates the criminal law, whether or not he is discovered or convicted. It is also true that undetected offenders, unapprehended criminals, offenders on bail, and under-trial offenders are also criminals. But value of such criterion for research purposes is seriously limited by the difficulties of securing a representative sample of such offenders. Compared with a sample of broad category of all violators of law, the sample of convicts would be small and limited. Moreover, the present researcher contends that in Pakistan, the convictions are more biased against the low socio-economic strata of the society and the 'powerless' groups. However, the prisoners are the only accessible subjects. Moreover, they are the ones who are available for correction and rehabilitation purpose. For a researcher who is using the convicts as subjects, the universe is well-defined.

To conclude, it is contended that crime, as legally defined, is a significant province of study and studying it from social-psychological angles has theoretical and practical implications. Therefore, for the practical purpose of the present research, the legal definition is followed. Criminal behaviour is defined as violation of law and a criminal as the person who has been tried under Pakistan Penal Code and convicted

by a court of law, and at time of data collection was serving a sentence of imprisonment in the prisons of the country.

The present study involved two samples of convicts, sample B and C. Two other samples, one of general public (sample A) and the other of non-criminals (sample D) were also used. The details of these samples are given below.

Sample A: One hundred and fifty one subjects including serving officers of different ranks from the law-enforcing agencies and representatives of general public were requested to fill-up the questionnaire used to tap the folk concept of a Professional criminal. The description of the respondents is as follows: 39 representatives of law administration such as judges, lawyers and prison authorities; 40 officials of police including junior and senior officers and 72 individuals of general public. All the respondents were male.

Sample B: A sample of 240 male convicts was randomly chosen from selected thirteen prisons of all the four provinces of the country. The criteria used for the selection of a prison were that from each administrative division of a particular province of the country, the prison with the largest population of convicts at the time of the data collection was selected. From each prison a maximum of 30 convicts were selected.

Sample C: A stratified random sample of 120 male convicts was taken from three prisons, one situated in Rawalpindi, the other two in nearby cities, namely Peshawar and Lahore. The selection of the prisons was determined by the convenience of data collection, and the fact that these three prisons are quite big in size and are assumed to be housing convicts not different from those of the other prisons of the country.

As regards the stratification of sample, it was decided to employ this technique so that more or less equal representation of the two broad types of crimes (criminal acts) could be achieved. These two types are property offenses and violence against person. In sample B which was randomly selected, there was an over-representation of those who had committed violence against person. This is so because the criminals who are convicted on charges of violence against person (murder, serious hurt, rape, kidnapping, etc.) are proportionately greater in number in a given prison. They earn a comparatively longer sentence by virtue of which these convicts keep on piling up in prisons whereas property offenders who serve shorter lengths of imprisonment do not stay long in the prison. Thus a researcher who is choosing convicts randomly do not get equal number of both the types simply because their distribution is not equal in the prison.

Stratification also helped in keeping the number of those subjects in sample C to a minimum who commit diverse types of crimes. Such crimes were included in sample B and had to be excluded from data being too diverse and few in each category to lead to any meaningful analysis (see findings).

Sample D: To compare the Acting-out behaviour of criminals with that of non-criminals, a comparable sample (sample D) of 60 non-criminals was selected from the vicinity of Quaid-i-Azam University, and a residential area in Islamabad. The mean age of the non-criminal subjects was 33.5 years, mean years of schooling as 4 years and they also mostly belonged to low-socio-economic strata.

INSTRUMENTS

The Folk Concept of a Professional Criminal Questionnaire

The researcher constructed 23 questions in such a way that each described a Professional criminal in the context of each of the five Classifying Variables and one

Demographic Variable, namely Occupational Life Pattern (see chapter 2 under Demographic Variables). A response to each question could indicate whether the respondent conceptually agrees with the researcher's conceptualization of a Professional criminal or not (The questionnaire used is given as annexure-A).

Interview-guide

An interview-guide was used to collect information on Classifying Variables, demographic characteristics and information on Early Home Environmental Conditions. Clinical study method was employed during the interviews, which means carrying-out an in-depth interviewing rather than having question-answer sessions.

The interview-guide used with sample B consisted of a number of parts aimed at obtaining information required for various analyses done at the different stages of the present research. The details are as follows: Part one was used to note a few particulars of the convict and information on Demographic Variables. Part two investigated whether or not the convict comes from a broken home. Questions contained in this part could also yield the information whether or not the home had psychological disruptions. Moreover, the questions were set in this part which could measure the nature of control and support as modes of discipline received by the subject from his parents in his early years of life. Part three traced the previous criminal record, and criminal associations among friends and relatives. Part four dealt, in details, with the background and the precipitating causes of the crime, and a few other relevant factors. (A copy of interview guide is enclosed as annexure-B).

Data on the sample C were collected with the help of a briefer version of the above mentioned interview guide. This was a briefer version only in the sense that it did not contain questions related to those variables on which data from sample C were not collected.

Socialization Scale of CPI

To measure the Socialization levels of the subjects, the adapted version of Socialization Scale (Ahmed, 1986) of California Psychological Inventory (CPI) was used. The brief description of the Inventory and the reasons of the selection of Socialization scale for this study have already appeared under description of 'Personality Characteristics' in chapter 2. A copy of the scale has been given as annexure-C.

Urdu Adjective Check-list

To measure Self-esteem of the subjects of the present study, an abbreviated version of Urdu Adjective Check-list (UACL) developed by Ansari, Farooqi, Yasmin, Khan, and Farooqi (1982) was used. In Pakistan not many studies have been done involving Self-esteem of the deviant individuals. The ones employing Adjective check-list as a medium of measurement are also sparse. Hassan (1982) used the above mentioned Adjective Check-list in her study of Psychological profile of a rural women in which the component of self-concept was an important dimension and was measured by those 65 adjectives which had empirically yielded highly positive or negative values. Later, Shafiq (1987) conducted a study on the self-concept of heroin addicts and made comparisons with that of the non-addicts. In this study, full-length list of 160 adjectives was used. The short version of UACL in the form of a five point rating scale comprising of 53 items which was used in the present research was the result of a factor analysis of the 160 original items. The Self-esteem scale is an empirically derived measure consisting of items of positive-negative items i.e., the adjectives generally considered positive and negative (for details see Ansari et al. 1982). Some of the items were indicative of the positive Self-esteem, and others were

contra-indicative. Further details of scoring are given shortly under Procedures. A copy of the Check-list used is given as Annexure-D.

The scores are also interpreted in terms of nine scales (based on Murray's (1965) theory of Personality Needs). The factor-analytic study quoted above had shown that only nine scales had significant factor loadings. These scales are Achievement, Aggression, Succorance, Nurturance, Affiliation, Autonomy, Abasement, Dominance, and Intelligence. Except for the scale of Intelligence, others are in terms of the Need theory of Murray (1965). Like Self-esteem scale, each of these scales has certain specific number of items, some of which are indicative of the attribute and others are contraindicative of the same attribute. The nine scales considered in the analysis are briefly described below:

1. *Achievement Scale*: To accomplish something difficult, and to master, manipulate or organize physical objects, human beings or ideas and to do this as rapidly and as independently as possible. It also indicates ability to overcome obstacles and attain a high standard. Thus, scale indicates individual trait to excel oneself and to rival and surpass others. The scale reveals the increasing capability of self-regard by the successful exercise of talent.
2. *Aggression Scale*: To overcome opposition forcefully and to fight, attack, injure or kill another. The scale also indicates dispositions to oppose forcefully or punish another, and to revenge an injury.
3. *Succorance Scale*: To have the needs gratified by the sympathetic aid of an allied object as well as desire to be nursed, supported, sustained, forgiven, and consoled. It reveals tendencies to remain close to a devoted protector and to seek always a supporter.

4. *Nurturance Scale*: To a disposition to give sympathy and gratify the needs of a helpless person, an infant or nay object that is weak, disabled, tired, inexperienced, defeated, humiliated, lonely, abjectly, sick, and mentally confused. The scale also indicates disposition to help, support, console, protect, comfort, nurse and heal.
5. *Affiliation Scale*: To draw near and enjoyably cooperate or reciprocate with an allied other particularly the one who resembles the subject or who likes the subject. The scale also reveals the ability to please and win affection of a cathected object. It also indicates a disposition to adhere and remain loyal to a friend.
6. *Autonomy Scale*: To act independently of others, to get free, to resist, and to avoid or quit activities prescribed by domineering authority.
7. *Abasement Scale*: To submit passively to external forces and to accept injury, blame, criticism, and punishment. This also reveals a tendency to surrender and become resigned to fate. The scale indicates a disposition to admit inferiority, error, wrong doing, or defeat. It also refers to a readiness to confess and mutilate the self and to seek and enjoy pain, punishment, illness and misfortune.
8. *Dominance Scale*: To control one's human environment and to influence or direct the behaviour of others by suggestion, seduction, persuasion and command. The scale also reveals the ability to dissuade, restrain or prohibit. It shows tendencies to be assertive, self assured, independent minded, hard, stern, solemn, unconventional, tough and attention getting.

9. *Intelligence Scale*: To be bright, conscientious, persevering, intellectual and cultured.

Hand Test

Some of the descriptions regarding the rationale and validity of the Hand Test appeared when we discussed the variable of Acting-out in the previous chapter. Some further information regarding its nature and administration is given below.

The Hand test consists of ten cards (see Annexure-E). On each card, except the last one, a different picture of a hand is portrayed. Tenth card is blank. The cards are presented to the subject one at a time and the subject must "project" by telling what the hand might be doing. For the last card the subject must imagine a hand and tell what it is doing. Responses are recorded verbatim later scored and interpreted according to 15 quantitative categories described below. A card is scored failure if a respondent does not provide a scorable response or fails to respond within hundred seconds or declines to provide a response. Summary scores are computed for comparisons and analysis.

Responses of the test are scored according to a set of 15 scoring categories which relate to type of activity perceived e.g. Direction, Affection, Communication, Aggression, etc. Responses in fifteen categories can be reduced to four major categories, Interpersonal (INT), Environmental (ENV), Maladjustive (MAL), and Withdrawal (WITH). The first two categories, INT and ENV, are typical of normals. MAL is typical of Neurotics and WITH is typical of psychotics. A brief description of each of these dimensions is as follows:

Interpersonal: Includes responses involving relations with other people. Affection (AFF), Dependence (DEP), and Communication (COM) responses are rated as socially positive while Direction (DIR) and Aggression (AGG) are rated socially negative.

Environmental: Responses represent generalized attitudes towards the interpersonal world. Acquisition (ACQ), Active (ACT) and Passive (PAS) responses are included in it.

Maladjustive: Consists of Tension (TEN), Crippled (CRIP) and Fear responses.

Withdrawal: Includes Description (DES), Failure (FAIL) and Bizarre (BIZ) responses.

The total number of interpersonal, environmental, maladjustive and withdrawal responses arranged in that order in a ratio is the Experience Ratio. It is intended as an overall estimate of the nature and disposition of an individual's psychological energies. In a normal protocol, the INT and ENV scores should be approximately equal and constitute 90% of the total responses.

A Pathological (PATH) score is calculated by adding total number of Maladjustive scores to twice the total number of Withdrawal score. It provides suitable bench marks for the assessment of degree of Pathology and since it is quantitative, it is also of value for reliability and validity studies. R is the total number of responses, not including any FAILS.

Among all the scoring categories the Acting-out Score (AOS) has been the most popular with clinicians and researchers. Acting-out is defined as the behaviour which brings the individual to the attention of others as a result of overt behaviour. In the Hand Test, the Acting-out scores is the difference between the sum of socialized interpersonal action tendencies denoted by AFF + DEP + COM ("shaking hands", "Asking for help" or Saying "Hello") and aggressive action tendencies denoted by AGG + DIR ("Telling someone what to do" and "Punching someone on the nose"). The more predominant the latter score over the former, the more the individual is likely to act out his impulses resulting in aggressive or/and anti-social behaviour. In normal

protocols, the ratio is balanced. Stoner (1978), reported that AOS is independent of sex differences and intelligence levels.

PROCEDURES

The Folk Concept of a Professional Criminal Questionnaire

The questionnaire containing 23 items was given to respondents who filled it up in the presence of the researcher. Questions seeking clarification of certain items were answered briefly by the researcher. Each filled-up questionnaire was checked with the help of a "Key" which indicated whether or not a response was in-accord with researcher's concept of a Professional criminal and hence showed concurrence or lack of it. The frequencies and percentages of in-accord responses were recorded item-wise as well as with respect to a particular construct or variable.

Data Collection from the Convicts

An interview with each convict was held after developing rapport with him. While building the rapport which, in average, lasted for 10 minutes, the purpose of the study was explained to each subject in the following words: "I am a student and studying the social psychological factors associated with the crime in Pakistan. One of the purposes is to study prisoners, their thinking and problems they face, so that we could recommend certain measures to improve the crime situation in general and prison conditions in particular. We need your help and cooperation. The information which you will give us will remain confidential."

The subjects were free to ask any question before or during the interview and testing. They were also told that the participation in the study was not obligatory on their part, and neither could it earn them any reduction in the length of

imprisonment or any other benefit as far as their "duties" or roles inside the prison were concerned.

Except for three subjects (two from sample B, and one from sample C), all others willingly participated in the study. Those who were not willing were not asked to participate. The subjects were interviewed and tested one by one at a relatively disturbance-free place inside the prison. During the interview, notes on the subject's responses to various questions were taken. After each interview the notes were reviewed, then the responses were analysed and a previously prepared analysis sheet was filled-up by the researcher in the light of given definitions of each variable. This filled-in analysis sheet on each convict was used for the statistical treatment of the data (the analyses sheet is given as appendix F).

Data were collected on classifying and other variables according to the procedure and with the help of instruments described above. Further relevant information related to the classification of criminal subjects of samples B and C is as follows:

Inter-Judge Reliability: To determine the interjudge reliability of the classification scheme, two individuals (one being the author) classified and judged about 25% convicts of both the samples (samples B & C) independently of each other. The percentage of agreement between the two judges for classification of convicts into two groups, namely Professional and Non-professional criminals has been reported in chapter 4.

Groups of Professional and Non-Professional Criminals: Each subject was judged to be Professional or Non-professional (in the light of given definitions) on each of the Classifying Variables (five in sample B, and three in sample C). However, the 2nd last (previous) offense of each subject was also considered as far as the

Judgement of Professional or Non-professional on 'Type of Crime' was concerned. In other words, Type of Crime was judged twice, one for the latest and one for the 2nd last or previous offense. As a result, each subject belonging to sample B could be judged six times Professional or Non-professional whereas a subject belonging to Sample C, could be judged four times as Professional or Non-professional. A subject was classified as Professional if he was judged so on at least one of the variables, whereas a subject was classified as Non-professional if he was judged so on all the Classifying Variables.

Extent or level of Professionalness: On the basis of judgements of subjects as Professional or Non-professional, their extent of professionalness could be determined which ranged from 1-6 in case of sample B and 1-4 in case of sample C, giving a score of 1 each time a subject was judged as Professional on the Classifying Variables (Type of Crime counted twice, for latest and 2nd last criminal acts). Thus, the extent of professionalness increased proportionally to the number of times an individual committed criminal acts.

Data on Early Home Environmental Conditions

Data were collected on three Early Home Environment Conditions described earlier with the help of the interview guide mentioned above (Operational definitions have already been given in chapter 2). The subjects were first classified as Professional and Non-professional criminals on the basis of Classifying Variables described earlier. The two types of criminals were compared with each other on Psychological Adversity Score derived in the manner described shortly. Their scores on professionalness scale were also obtained to see their distribution in the Early Home Environmental Conditions.

Psychological Adversity Score: A subject got a score of 1 for each of the three psychologically adverse conditions described above, if it was established that he had been exposed to that condition in life. Thus each subject could obtain 0-3 score called the Psychological Adversity Score.

Administration of Personality Tests

Socialization Scale of CPI: The subjects (Sample C) were administered the questionnaire consisting of items included in the So (Socialization) scale of the adapted version of CPI (Ahmed, 1986). This questionnaire was specially prepared for the illiterate subjects. The questionnaire was administered individually by reading out each item and marking the response as "Yes" or "No". Even if a subject could read and respond to the questionnaire himself the above procedure was not changed. The scores were subjected mainly to t-test analysis to see the significance of differences between Professional and Non-professional criminals.

UACL for Measuring Self-esteem: Subjects (Sample C) were individually asked to respond to each item of UACL (indicating an attribute or a quality) as applicable to his 'self'. The subjects rated each item on one of the five given categories ranging from "very less" to "very much". Response on each item was given weightage according to its category i.e., 1 score for the response on category 'very less', 2 for 'less', 3 for 'average', 4 for 'much' and 5 for 'very much'. Each response score was tabularized, according to the scale of 'Self-esteem'. Indicative and contraindicative were identified. The score on each of the contraindicative items was defined for calculation in such a way that it became indicative for the scale. This was achieved simply by reversing the weightage given to the each category of the scale. For example, if on any one item which is contraindicative of a scale, a rating of 5 is scored as 1 degree indicative of scale. Similarly a rating of 4 is scored as 2, of 3 as 3, of 2 as 4, and of 1 as 5. With the help of the raw scores (scores on indicative and contraindicative items) mean and standard

deviation were calculated for the Self-esteem and other scales for Professional and Non-professional criminals. Then t-tests were computed to see the difference between the two means.

Hand Test for Measuring Acting-out Behaviour: Hand Test was administered to the criminal subjects (Sample C) and non-criminal subjects (Sample D) according to the standardized procedure and instructions (Wagner, 1983). The test was administered individually. Each card was shown one by one and responses were recorded verbatim. A subject was asked to give any number of responses he could think of. In case a response was ambiguous, a query was made to make the response classifiable. Responses of the test were scored according to the set of 15 quantitative scoring categories which relate to type of activity perceived by the individual. The analysis of the data was carried out employing mainly *t*-test to see significant differences on Hand Test Scores between the two groups of criminals (i.e., Professionals and Non-professionals), and between criminals and non-criminals.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In this chapter, findings on the various variables of the present research have been given followed by a discussion on the findings in the next chapter. First of all are presented results of the study in which the present researcher's conceptualization of a Professional Criminal (as discussed at length in chapter 2) was matched with that of the layman and significant others. After that is given the analysis of data on classifying variables on the basis of which the criminal subjects have been classified into the two proposed categories namely Professional and Non-professional criminals. The two groups thus elicited are compared on a number of variables to prepare a social-psychological profile of the Professional and Non-professional Criminals. These findings have been presented under Demographic Variables, Early Home Environmental Conditions, and Personality Characteristics.

I-A FOLK CONCEPT OF A PROFESSIONAL CRIMINAL

Table 1 indicates item-wise percentages of concurrence between researcher's conceptualization of a Professional criminal and those of the three groups of respondents.

Table 1

Frequencies and percentages of item-wise concurrence between respondents' (Sample A) and the researcher's conceptualization

Items	Law-Admin. N=39		Police N=40		Gen. Public N=72		Total N=151	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1.	29	74	38	95	48	67	115	76
2.	32	82	39	98	46	64	117	77
3.	22	56	34	85	49	68	105	70
4.	38	97	32	80	68	94	138	91
5.	31	79	36	90	45	63	112	74
6.	27	69	36	90	51	71	114	75
7.	28	72	33	83	58	81	119	79
8.	32	82	34	85	59	82	125	83
9.	29	74	31	78	67	93	127	84
10.	27	69	39	98	53	74	119	79
11.	30	77	40	100	59	82	129	85
12.	34	87	29	73	57	79	120	79
13.	32	82	33	83	65	90	130	86
14.	23	59	39	98	45	63	107	71
15.	14	36	23	58	24	33	61	40
16.	35	90	36	90	66	92	137	91
17.	33	85	37	93	61	85	131	87
18.	32	82	28	70	59	82	119	79
19.	25	64	34	85	49	68	108	72
20.	27	69	37	93	42	58	106	70
21.	18	46	18	46	30	42	66	44
22.	35	90	36	90	61	85	132	87
23.	34	87	35	88	62	86	131	87
Average Percentages		74		84		74		77

Table 2 presents the variable-wise percentage of concurrence. These percentages have been obtained by averaging the percentages of relevant items tapping a particular construct or a variable.

Table 2

Construct-wise percentages of concurrence between respondents' (Sample A) and the researcher's conceptualization

Construct with Item Nos.	Law/ Admin. N=39	General Public N=72	Police N=40	Total N=151
Type of Crime (Items 3,5,8,13,16,19-22)	82	78	87	82
Past Criminal Record (Items 2,4,14 & 20)	87	70	100	82
Victim Relationship (Items 9,10,11,12-18)	86	82	84	83
Premeditation (Items 7,15 & 21)	54	52	75	55
Criminal Associations (Items 6,17 & 23)	83	81	90	84
Occupational Life Pattern (Item 1)	85	67	95	83

Table 1 indicates that a high level of concurrence exists between the researcher's conceptualization of a Professional criminal and that of the respondents on all items except on items 15 and 21 which pertained to the construct of Premeditation (see table 2). Excluding items 15 and 21, the percentage range of concurrence on 21 remaining items is 70 to 91. However, an overall average of 77 has been observed including the percentages on items 15 and 21. The average percentage could rise to about 80 if the percentages on items 15 and 21 were not considered and were excluded from calculations.

As regards the construct-wise analysis, it may be noted in table 2 that in each construct, the average percentage is above 80 except in case of the construct of Premeditation (tapped by items, 7, 15 and 21) which shows a low level of concurrence.

As regards the items 15 and 21 showing low concurrence, it should be noted that another item, i.e., item 7 taps the same construct, namely, Premeditation and has a concurrence percentage as high as 79. In fact, most respondents agreed to item 7 that a Professional criminal usually commits premeditated crimes. However, when asked in item 15 whether they agreed or not with the statement that a Non-professional criminal commits premeditated crime to take revenge, they ignored the 'Yes' and 'No' options and some of them wrote on the answer sheet, 'not necessarily' perhaps meaning that a Non-professional criminal may or may not plan his crime to take revenge. Similarly, in response to item 21 in which it was stated that a Non-professional plans a crime due to interpersonal conflicts and disputes, most of the respondents again replied that it was not necessary that they would plan it; they might or might not. This resulted in a low level of concurrence because these responses were excluded from analysis. However, this could mean that the respondents do think that even a Non-professional criminal may commit a premeditated crime in certain situations and for certain objectives though fully knowing that their crimes usually take place in spur of a moment under situational pressures. In this way, the items, in fact, indicate agreement with the researcher's view, rather than any disagreement (see description of Professional criminal regarding the construct Premeditation in chapter 2 under Classifying Variables).

The general conclusion of the above reported findings could be that the laymen do perceive differences between different types of criminals and that their view of a Professional criminal matches closely with the researcher's conceptualization of a Professional criminal. The further research question is whether or not the real life

criminals can be categorized in terms of the two postulated types. The findings on the Classifying Variables have been presented in the following section.

II-CLASSIFICATION OF CRIMINALS INTO PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL CATEGORIES

In the preceding section, we have seen that there exists a concurrence between the researcher's conceptualization of a Professional criminal and the way the laymen perceive a Professional criminal. The variables on which these perceptions are based are mainly six, namely Type of Crime, Past Criminal Record, Relationship with the Victim, Premeditation, Criminal Associations and Occupational Life Pattern. Five out of these six variables have been employed for the empirical verification of the classification scheme on sample B of the convicted prisoners. The sixth variable of Occupational Life Pattern has been included in the comparisons between Professional and Non-professional criminals on demographic and other variables. The detailed descriptions of the five Classifying Variables have appeared earlier along with their operational definitions for the purpose of classification (see chapter 2).

The findings of data on sample B were replicated employing another sample of convicted prisoners (sample C) for reasons noted earlier (see chapter 2). However, in the second data collection, only three variables, namely Type of Crime, Past Criminal Record, and Relationship with the Victim were included. The variables of Premeditation and Criminal Associations were dropped for a couple of reasons. Firstly, the judgement of subjects into Professional and Non-professional categories was somewhat unclear as evidenced by relatively low interjudge reliability on these two variables (see findings in this section). Moreover, it was relatively difficult to collect data on these two variables. Based mainly on self-reports of the convicts, lengthy interviewing was required to elicit information whether or not the crime was premeditated, and whether the subject had Criminal Associations with those who themselves practiced criminal behaviour. The subjects had to respond through retrospection and many diagnostic questions were needed to be asked before the

researcher could decide about the nature of in-coming information. For these reasons, the two variables were dropped.

Though the main objective at this stage of the research is to classify criminal subjects (samples B and C) in the two proposed categories according to the definitions of Classifying Variables, yet a few additional analyses were carried out to elicit information which could help understand the findings on classification in a better way. Therefore, the specific objectives of the analyses of data on both the samples being reported in this section are as following:

- (a) To identify types of criminal acts committed by the subjects.
- (b) To see consistency between the nature of the present (most recent) and the past criminal acts.
- (c) To classify subjects in terms of the proposed classification of two broad types, (Professional and Non-professional criminals) on the basis of defined Classifying Variables.
- (d) To see the extent to which Classifying Variables relate to each other.
- (e) To see the differences between Professional and Non-professional criminals on each of the Classifying Variables.

Though data from samples B and C were collected and analysed in different time periods, these are being presented together for clarity and better understanding of the findings.

(a) Types of Criminal Acts

Table 3 shows that there were 24 different types of criminal acts which the randomly selected subjects of sample B had committed. It can be seen that there were about 165 subjects who had committed violence against person consisting of crimes like murder, injury to body and sexual offenses predominantly rape, etc. (categories 1 to 5 in table 3).

Table 3
Nature of Latest and 2nd last Criminal Acts (sample B)

Nature of Crime	Latest Crime		2nd Last Crime	
	f	%	f	%
<i>Violence against person</i>				
1. Murder	54	22.50	7	10.29
2. Attempted Murder (Injury to Body, Hurt)	91	37.92	27	39.71
3. Murder, Hurt while protecting property	2	0.83	1	1.47
4. Murder/Hurt in fatal accidents	3	1.25	1	1.47
<i>Sexual offenses</i>				
5. Rape, Zina (sexual intercourse i.e. adultery)	15	6.25	1	1.47
6. Homosexuality	4	1.67	0	-
7. Prostitution/Running Prostitution Dens.	2	0.83	0	-
<i>Crimes against property</i>				
8. Robbery with use of violence	8	3.75	4	5.88
9. Robbery without use of violence	13	5.42	6	8.82
10. Burglary/Larceny	20	8.33	10	14.71
11. Pick-pocketing	5	2.08	2	2.94

(Continued on the next page)

(Table—3 continued from the previous page)

12. Gambling	1	0.42	1	1.47
13. Embezzlement/Cheating (Wrongful gains)	1	0.42	2	2.94
14. Cattle Theft	1	0.42	0	-
<i>Miscellaneous offenses</i>				
15. Prohibition (Drinking alcohol)	1	0.42	1	1.47
16. Narcotics (Drugs, etc.)	2	0.83	2	2.94
17. Illicit possession of Arms	1	0.42	1	1.47
18. Rioting/Commotion/ Public Disorder/Arson	1	0.42	0	-
19. Spreading hatred between public & Army	1	0.42	0	-
20. Suicide/Self-immolation	2	0.83	0	-
21. Vagrancy/Beggary	2	0.83	1	1.47
22. Teasing women at market places	2	0.83	1	1.47
23. Army Desertion	5	2.08	0	-
24. Violations of price control/weights and measures regulations	2	0.83	0	-
Total:	240		68	

As regards the property offenses there were about 49 such cases (categories 8 to 14) which could be considered crimes against property. However, there were 20 such cases who had committed criminal acts of diverse nature. Table 3 gives the details of such offenses which include use and sale of alcohol and drugs, illicit possession of arms, rioting and creating law and order situation, spreading hatred between public and army, suicide, vagrancy, teasing women at market places, army desertion and violation of price control, weights and measures regulations. As these twenty

criminal acts were found in small numbers, and as it was somewhat difficult to judge them in terms of "Professionalness" or "Non-professionalness", these were excluded from the data. The remaining criminal acts could be judged in the following three categories: (1) Violence against person including crimes like murder, attempted murder, murder/hurt while protecting property and murder/hurt in fatal accidents; (2) sexual offenses consisting of cases of rape, adultery, homosexuality and prostitution etc., and (3) property offenses such as robbery (with or without use of violence), burglary, pick-pocketing, gambling, and embezzlement, etc. As a result of exclusion of 20 sundry offenses, there were left 150 cases of violence, 21 cases of sexual offenses, and 49 cases of property offenses. The further analysis of data on sample B is, therefore, on these 220 cases only.

Similarly, the previous offenses of sample B were also grouped into the above mentioned three categories. It can be seen in table 3 that there were 68 subjects in total who had committed at least one illegal act in the past as well. The nature of their crimes was as follows: there were 36 cases of violence against person, 24 cases of property offenses and 1 offense of sexual nature. As regards the cases which were of diverse nature and which were difficult to judge in terms of Professional and Non-professionalness of crimes, these were six in number as the details given in the following: 1 case of Prohibition (drinking alcohol), 2 cases of use and sale of drugs, 1 case of illicit possession of arms, 1 case of vagrancy, and 1 case of teasing women at the market place.

Table 4 shows that among subjects of sample C ($N= 120$) taken after stratification according to the types of criminal acts, there were 50 subjects who had committed violence against person (combining first 4 categories of murder and serious hurt, etc.) and 50 had committed property offenses (combining categories 8 to 14. The number of subjects who had committed sexual offenses was 13 (combining categories 5 to 7 shown in table 4). There were nine such subjects in whose case

information regarding certain important dimensions of Classifying Variables, background characteristics or/and personality tests, etc. was missing because these subjects were not available for interviewing/testing at a stretch and were forced by administration to leave without completing information on interview/tests. Such cases had to be excluded from the data analyses. As a result, further analyses involving subjects of sample C include only one hundred and eleven subjects.

Table 4
Nature of Latest and 2nd last Criminal Acts (sample C)

Nature of Crime	Latest Crime		2nd Last Crime	
	f	%	f	%
<i>Violence against person</i>				
1. Murder	19	15.83	1	2.08
2. Attempted Murder (Injury to Body, Hurt)	29	24.17	14	29.17
3. Murder, Hurt while protecting property	1	0.83	1	2.08
4. Murder/Hurt in fatal accidents	1	0.83	1	2.08
<i>Sexual offenses</i>				
5. Rape, Zina (sexual intercourse i.e. adultery)	10	8.33	1	2.08
6. Homosexuality	1	0.83	0	-
7. Prostitution/Running Prostitution Dens.	2	1.67	0	-
<i>Crimes against property</i>				
8. Robbery with use of violence	10	8.33	3	6.25
9. Robbery without use of violence	12	10.00	6	12.50
10. Burglary/Larceny	22	18.33	11	22.92
11. Pick-pocketing	2	1.67	1	2.08
12. Gambling	1	0.83	1	2.08

(Continued on the next page)

(Table— 4 continued from the previous page)

13. Embezzlement/Cheating (Wrongful gains)	1	0.83	1	2.08
14. Cattle Theft	2	1.67	2	4.17
<i>Miscellaneous offenses</i>				
15. Prohibition (Drinking alcohol)	1	0.83	1	2.08
16. Narcotics (Drugs, etc.)	2	1.67	2	4.17
17. Illicit possession of arms	1	0.83	1	2.08
18. Rioting/Commotion/ Public Disorder/Arson	1	0.83	0	-
19. Army Desertion	2	1.67	1	2.08
Total:	120		48	

The frequency distribution of the type of 2nd last crime among subjects of sample C in table 4 shows that only 48 (i.e., less than one third of the total sample) had committed at least one crime in the past as well. Five of these were of diverse nature and were excluded from data. Two subjects had given incomplete information on demographic or/and personality variables because they had to leave testing session unexpectedly. These cases were also excluded from data analyses. The distribution of remaining 41 criminal acts into three categories is as follows: 17 violence against person, 23 property offenses, and 1 case of sexual offense.

(b) Consistency between Present and Past Criminal Acts

As mentioned above, for a meaningful analysis of data, some types of criminal acts (shown in tables 3 & 4) were merged into each other to get categories of (a) Violence (b) Sexual offenses, and (c) Property offenses. Some sexual offenses are a kind of violence against person (some because homosexuality with mutual consent may not be considered violence, yet it is illegal in Pakistan). However, these are kept separate

assuming that these may yield some important comparison with other types of criminal acts.

Table 5 shows that there is a consistency in type of crime when latest and 2nd last criminal acts were compared. Looking at the row totals, it can be seen that out of 34 cases of murder and hurt in sample B, 27 had committed murder both in their latest and 2nd last criminal acts. Similarly out of 24 property offenders, 14 had committed a property offense in the past too. However, 3 subjects convicted for sexual offenses as their latest crimes had committed property offense in the past.

Table 5
Distribution of Type of Crime (latest) in Type of Crime (2nd last) for sample B.

Type of Crime (latest)	Type of Crime (2nd last)			Total
	Violence	Property Offenses	Sexual Offenses	
Violence	27	7	0	34
Property Offenses	9	14	1	24
Sexual Offenses	0	3	0	3
Total	36	24	1	61

$$\chi^2 = 15.64 \quad df = 4 \quad p < 0.00$$

Table 6
Distribution of Type of Crime (latest) in Type of Crime (2nd last) for sample C

Type of Crime (latest)	Type of Crime (2nd last)			Total
	Violence	Property Offenses	Sexual Offenses	
Violence	14	2	0	16
Property Offenses	3	19	0	22
Sexual Offenses	0	2	1	3
Total	17	23	1	41

$$\chi^2 = 35.27 \quad df = 4 \quad p < 0.00$$

This trend is somewhat more pronounced as regards the results of sample C shown in table 6. For example, if we look at the row totals, it can be seen that out of 16 cases of murder and hurt, there were 14 such cases who had committed violence in the past as well. Similarly, out of 22 cases of property offenses, 19 had at least one previous record of property offense as well. From three sexual offenders, one had committed a sexual offense in the past as well, and two of them had committed property offense.

(c) Classification: Professional and Non-Professional Criminals

Subjects were judged (in the light of given definitions) as Professional or Non-professional on each of the five classifying variables for sample B, and three Classifying Variables for sample C. Those who were judged as Professional on one or more of the Classifying Variables, were finally categorized as "Professionals," and those who were judged on all the Classifying Variables as "Non-professional" were finally categorized as "Non-professionals". As a result, it has been shown in table 7 that from 220 subjects of sample B, 67 were judged as Professional, whereas 153 were judged as Non-professionals. However, out of 111 subjects of sample C, 55 were judged as Professional and 56 as Non-professionals.

Table 7

Number of subjects judged as Professional and Non-professional Criminals from Samples B and C

	Sample B (N=220)	Sample C (N=120)
Professional	67	55
Non-Professional	153	56
Total	220	111

As regards the interjudge reliability of classification of subjects into the two groups, namely Professional and Non-professional criminals, it can be seen in table 8 that the agreement between the two judges is quite high on three variables, namely Type of latest Crime, Type of previous Crime, and Past Criminal Record, whereas it was not that high on the remaining two variables, namely Premeditation and Criminal Associations. On first three variables, 90% to 97% of the cases were judged with an agreement as being Professional or Non-professional, whereas in case of the last two variables the percentage agreement was 75% on Premeditation and 62% on Criminal Associations.

Table 8

Frequencies and Percentages of agreement between two judges for judgement as Professional and Non-professional Criminals on each of the Classifying Variables (N= 60 i.e. 27% of the total sample B)

Variables	Frequencies Agreed	Frequencies Not-agreed	Percentages of Agreement
Type of Crime (Latest)	58	2	97
Type of Crime (Previous)	54	6	90
Past Criminal Record	57	3	95
Relationship with the victim	54	6	90
Premeditation	45	15	75
Criminal Associations	37	23	62

Table 9

Frequencies and Percentages of agreement between two judges for judgement as Professional and Non-professional Criminals on each of the Classifying Variables (N= 30 i.e. 25% of the total sample C)

Variables	Frequencies Agreed	Frequencies Not-agreed	Percentages of Agreement
Type of Crime (Latest)	29	1	97
Type of Crime (Previous)	27	3	90
Past Criminal Record	29	1	97
Relationship with the victim	26	4	86

As regards the sample C, the findings shown in table 9 indicate that the agreement percentage on the three variables studied ranged from a minimum of 86 (Relationship with the Victim) to 97% both for Type of Crime (latest) and Past Criminal Record.

(d) Relationship between Classifying Variables

Table 10 shows the relationship between the judgements as "Professional" or "Non-Professional" criminal on each of the classifying variables. It can be seen that for sample B the high correlations are between Type of Crime (2nd last) and Past Criminal Record (.93); between Type of Crime (latest) and Relationship with the Victim (.90) and between Type of Crime (latest) and Premeditation (.91). The moderate correlations are between Type of Crime (latest) and Criminal Association (.60); between Relationship with the Victim and Criminal Associations (.55); and between Premeditation and Criminal Associations (.58). The remaining correlations were somewhat towards the lower side.

Table 10

Correlation Matrices of Judgements as Professional or Non-Professional Criminals on latest Type of Crime , 2nd last Type of Crime , Past Criminal Record, Relationship with the Victim, Premeditation and Criminal Associations (Sample B).

	Latest Crime	2nd Last Crime	Past Criminal Record	Victim Relationship	Premeditation	Criminal Association
Latest Crime	-	.38	.34	.90	.91	.60
2nd Last Crime			.93	.38	.31	.30
Past Record				.34	.27	.22
Vict.Relation					.84	.55
Premeditation						.58
Crime Association						-

Table 11

Correlation Matrices of Judgements as Professional or Non-Professional Criminals on Type of Crime (latest), Type of Crime (2nd last), Past Criminal Record, and Relationship with the Victim (Sample C).

	Latest Crime Type	2nd Last Crime Type	Past Record	Victim Relation
Latest Crime Type	-	.62	.65	.63
2nd Last Crime Type			.86	.47
Past Record				.52
Victim Relation				-

As regards the sample C, it can be seen in table 11 that the highest correlation is again between variables of Type of Crime (2nd last) and Past Criminal Record (.86). The other correlations are moderate, the lowest being between Type of Crime (2nd last) and Relationship with the Victim (.47).

It seems that if a subject is judged to be Professional on one Classifying Variable, he is quite likely to be judged as Professional on other Classifying Variables too, but not on all of them.

(e) Differences between Professional and Non-professional Criminals on Classifying Variables:

Tables 12 to 21 show the comparison between Professional and Non-professional criminals on each of the Classifying Variables.

It should be noted that as regards the difference between Professional and Non-professional criminals on the variables of Type of Crime, latest as well as 2nd last, the analysis makes use of three types of crimes derived by merging different categories of

criminal acts shown in tables 3. These three types are Violent offenses of murder, hurt etc., property offenses with or without use of violence, and sexual offenses.

Tables 12 and 13 show a significant difference between Professional and Non-Professional criminals on the Type of Crime (latest).

Table 12

Type of Criminal and Latest Type of Crime (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	Type of Crime (Latest)			Total
	Violence	Property Offenses	Sexual Offenses	
Professional	15	48	4	67
Non-professional	135	1	17	153
Total	150	49	21	220

$\chi^2 = 136.35$ $df=2$ $p < 0.00$

Table 13

Type of Criminal and Latest Type of Crime (Sample C)

Type of Criminal	Type of Crime (Latest)			Total
	Violence	Property Offenses	Sexual Offenses	
Professional	10	42	3	55
Non-professional	40	6	10	56
Total	50	48	13	111

$\chi^2 = 73.39$ $df=2$ $p < 0.00$

It can be seen that Professionals committed predominantly property offenses: 48 out of 67 in case of sample B and 42 out of 55 in case of sample C, whereas Non-Professionals committed more frequently violence against person (murder, hurt, or sexual offenses) (135 + 17=152 out of 153 in case of sample B and 40 + 10= 50 out of 56 in sample of C). The similar findings can be observed as regards the 2nd last crime in tables 14 and 15 which show that Professionals commit mostly property offenses, and Non-professionals commit violence against person. Out of 37 Professional criminals 24 had committed property offenses, whereas hundred percent of 24 Non-professional criminals had committed violence against person (table 14). Similarly, out of 28 Professional criminals 23 had committed property offenses, whereas out of 13 Non-professional criminals, 12 had committed violent crimes.

Table 14

Type of Criminal and Type of Crime (2nd last) (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	Type of Crime (2nd last)			Total
	Violence	Property Offenses	Sexual Offenses	
Professional	12	24	1	37
Non-professional	24	0	0	24
Total	36	24	1	61

$$\chi^2 = 27.47 \quad df=2 \quad p < 0.00$$

Table 15

Type of Criminal and Type of Crime (2nd last)(Sample C)

Type of Criminal	Type of Crime (2nd last)			Total
	Violence	Property Offenses	Sexual Offenses	
Professional	5	23	0	28
Non-professional	12	0	1	13
Total	17	23	1	41

$$\chi^2 = 24.70 \quad df=2 \quad p < 0.00$$

The chi-square analysis reveals that all of these differences between two types of criminals are quite significant.

As regards the type of criminal (i.e., Professional or Non-professional) related to Past Criminal Record, it can be seen in tables 16 and 17 that Professionals have Past Criminal Record more frequently (38 out of 67 in case of sample B, and 29 out of 55 in case of sample C) as compared with the Non-professionals (only 24 out of 153 in case of sample B and 17 out of 56 in case of sample C).

Table 16

Type of Criminal and Past Criminal Record (PCR) (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	Past Criminal Record		Total
	Had PCR	Not had PCR	
Professional	38	29	67
Non-professional	24	129	153
Total	62	158	220

$$\chi^2 = 36.75 \quad df=1 \quad p < 0.00$$

Table 17

Type of Criminal and Past Criminal Record (PCR) (Sample C)

Type of Criminal	Past Criminal Record		Total
	Had PCR	Not had PCR	
Professional	29	26	55
Non-professional	17	39	56
Total	46	65	111

$$\chi^2 = 4.84 \quad df=1 \quad p < 0.02$$

The chi-square analysis indicates that the two groups of criminals are significantly different as far as the variable of Past Criminal Record is concerned.

The difference between the two types of criminals on the variable of Relationship with the Victim has been shown in tables 18 and 19. It is evident that Professionals have been committing mostly those crimes where there was no victim involved or their victims were not known to them. It can be seen that there were only 20 such cases out of 67 in sample B, and 17 out of 55 in sample C where the subjects categorized as Professional "knew" their victims.

Table 18

Type of Criminal and Relationship with the Victim (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	Relationship with the victim			Total
	Known	Not known	Victimless	
Professional	20	26	21	67
Non-professional	150	3	0	153
Total	170	29	21	220

$$\chi^2 = 123.98 \quad df=2 \quad p < 0.00$$

Table 19

Type of Criminal and Relationship with the Victim (Sample C)

Type of Criminal	Relationship with the victim			Total
	Known	Not known	Victimless	
Professional	17	19	19	55
Non-professional	56	0	0	56
Total	73	19	19	111

$$\chi^2 = 58.83 \quad df=2 \quad p < 0.00$$

On the other hand, Non-professionals' criminal acts predominantly involved those victims who were personally known to the offenders (150 out of 153 in case of sample B and all the 56 cases in sample C). The difference between Professional and Non-professional criminals was significant according to the chi-square analysis.

When Professional and Non-professional criminals (subjects of sample B) are compared with each other on the variable of Premeditation in table 20, it is found out that Professionals more frequently premeditated and planned their crimes (45 of 69) whereas Non-professionals committed predominantly non-premeditated crimes (123 out of 151).

Table 20

Type of Criminal and Premeditation (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	Premeditated	Not-premeditated	Total
Professional	45	24	69
Non-professional	28	123	151
Total	73	147	220

$$\chi^2 = 45.75 \quad df=1 \quad p < 0.00$$

This difference was significant according to the chi-square analysis.

As regards the Types of Criminal and the variable of Criminal Associations, it was found out in table 21 that from subjects of sample B those categorized as Professional criminals tend to have links and relations with those who themselves have criminal ways of life, whereas Non-professionals do not usually have such Criminal Associations.

Table 21

Type of Criminal and Criminal Association (CA) (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	Had CA	Not had CA	Total
Professional	41	28	69
Non-professional	15	136	151
Total	56	164	220

$\chi^2 = 58.54$ $df=1$ $p < 0.00$

It can be noted that among a total of 69 Professional criminals, 41 had Criminal Associations whereas among 151 Non-professionals, only 15 reported having had such associations. This difference was statistically significant.

(f) Level of Professionalness and Classifying Variables

The above reported results have been analyzed and presented in another way too. It may be recalled that the level of professionalness was determined by giving a score of 1 each time a subject was judged as Professional on each of the Classifying Variables. This score could range from 1 to 6 in case of sample B, and 1 to 4 in case of sample C, Type of Crime considered twice, for latest and 2nd last criminal acts. Thus the level of professionalness increased proportionally to the number of times an individual committed criminal acts.

In the tables 22 to 31, the level of professionalness has been seen turn by turn in relation to each of the classifying variable, 6 for sample B and 4 for sample C. However, it should be noted that as the level of professionalness was obtained from the judgement on each of the Classifying Variables, giving a score of 1 each time a subject was judged to be Professional, the total professionalness score also included the contributory score, if any, of the relevant variable on which the level of professionalness is being seen. To counter this bias, the level of professionalness was

computed with respect to judgement as Professional or Non-professional on a specific variable by excluding the contributory score of that variable from the total score.

Table 22 shows the mean scores of professionalism earned by subjects who had committed various types of crimes. It can be seen that in sample B, the mean scores of 150 subjects who had committed violent crimes of murder or hurt etc., was 0.18, but the mean professionalism score of property offenders was as high as 2.86. As regards the sample C, similar findings given in table 23 can be observed as the mean score of subjects who had committed violence against person was 0.21, but the property offenders scored much higher mean scores i.e., 1.70. The differences across types were highly significant according to the one-way analysis of variance done on the data.

Table 22

Level of Professionalness and latest Type of Crime (Sample B)

Type of Crime	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Violence	150	0.18	0.86
Property Offenses	49	2.86	1.38
Sexual Offenses	21	0.38	0.57
Total	220	0.80	1.39

$F=187.98$ $df= 219$ $p < 0.00$

Table 23

Level of Professionalness and latest Type of Crime (Sample C)

Type of Crime	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Violence	50	0.21	0.59
Property Offenses	48	1.70	1.29
Sexual Offenses	13	0.31	0.75
Total	111	0.86	1.20

$F=29.63$ $df= 110$ $p < 0.00$

Sexual offenders in both the samples B and C scored more or less equal scores (0.38 and 0.31 respectively as shown in tables 22 and 23. Their low scores also suggest that they are closer to criminals of murder and hurt, rather than to property offenders.

Tables 24 and 25 show the similar findings as regards the 2nd last offense of the subjects of both the samples B and C. Those who committed violent crimes scored less on level of professionalism scale (0.97) and Property offenders scored as high as 3.29. The difference between the two types was highly significant.

Table 24

Level of Professionalness and 2nd last Type of Crime (Sample B)

Type of Crime	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Violence	36	0.97	1.42
Property Offenses	24	3.29	1.73
Sexual Offenses	1	4.00	(-)
Total	61	1.93	1.92
<i>F</i> = 16.95 <i>df</i> = 60 <i>p</i> < 0.00			

Table 25

Level of Professionalness and 2nd last Type of Crime (Sample C)

Type of Crime	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Violence	17	0.29	0.59
Property Offenses	23	2.74	0.96
Sexual Offenses	1	0.00	(-)
Total	41	1.66	1.48
<i>F</i> = 44.83 <i>df</i> = 40 <i>p</i> < 0.00			

However, there is one finding to be noted in particular is that of sexual offender in sample B scoring very high professionalism score (i.e., 4.00) compared with sample

C sexual offenders who scored 0. However, as the number of cases is so small (i.e. 1 in each sample), it is difficult to infer anything from these findings.

As regards the level of professionalism and Past Criminal Record, it has been shown in tables 26 and 27 that those who had Past Criminal Record scored mean scores of 1.92 for sample B, and 1.54 for sample C whereas those who did not have such a record scored less (i.e. 0.47 in case of sample B, and 0.63 in case of sample C).

Table 26

Level of Professionalness and Past Criminal Record (PCR) (Sample B)

Past Criminal Record	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Had PCR	62	1.92	1.11
Not had PCR	158	0.47	1.94
Total	220	0.88	1.54

$t = 6.91$ $df = 218$ $p < 0.00$

Table 27

Level of Professionalness and Past Criminal Record (PCR)
(Sample C)

Past Criminal Record	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Had PCR	46	1.54	1.44
Not had PCR	65	0.63	0.84
Total	111	1.01	1.21

$t = 4.20$ $df = 109$ $p < 0.00$

The difference between those who had Past Criminal Record and those who did not have such a record was statistically significant according to the 't-test' analysis done on the data.

In tables 28 and 29, the level of professionalism was compared among subjects whose victims were "known" to them (0.24, sample B; 0.41 sample, C), "Not known" to them (2.55, sample B; 1.79, sample C), and who had committed victimless crimes (3.00 in case of sample B, and 1.95 in case of sample C).

Table 28

Level of Professionalness and Relationship with the Victim (Sample B)

Relationship with the Victims	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Known	170	0.24	0.71
Not known	29	2.55	1.57
Victimless	21	3.00	1.30
Total	220	0.81	1.40

$F = 140.43$ $df = 219$ $p < 0.00$

Table 29

Level of Professionalness and Relationship with the Victim (Sample C)

Relationship with the Victims	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Known	73	0.41	0.88
Not known	19	1.79	1.40
Victimless	19	1.95	1.35
Total	111	0.91	1.27

$F = 23.26$ $df = 110$ $p < 0.00$

It can be noted that the highest mean scores in both the samples is of those who had committed "victimless" crimes. The one-way analysis of variance suggests that the difference between the categories of Relationship with the Victim was quite significant.

In table 30, the level of professionalism was seen in Premeditated and Non-premeditated Crimes by subjects of sample B.

Table 30
Level of Professionalness and Premeditation (Sample B)

Premeditated	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Premeditated	74	1.79	1.76
Not-premeditated	146	0.31	0.90
Total	220	0.82	1.43

$t = 8.17$ $df = 218$ $p < 0.00$

It was found out that those who committed Premeditated crimes scored 1.79 mean score of professionalness and those who committed Non-premeditated Crimes scored 0.31 only. The difference between the two groups was highly significant according to the 't-test' analysis of difference.

The next table i.e., Table 31 shows the level of professionalness among those who had Criminal Associations (1.95) to be much higher than the score of those who did not have any such associations (0.46).

Table 31
Level of Professionalness and Criminal Association (CA)
(Sample B)

Criminal Association	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Had CA	56	1.95	1.92
Not had CA	164	0.46	1.08
Total	220	0.84	1.49

$t = 7.16$ $df = 218$ $p < 0.00$

The difference was statistically significant when the 't-test' analysis was done.

III-A COMPARATIVE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PROFILE

After having seen that a majority of Pakistani prisoners can be categorized into Professional and Non-professional criminals, the research proceeds to demonstrate that these two types present a differential social-psychological profile. Three sets of variables have been employed for that. Firstly are the Demographic Variables which include venue of crime, Age, Socio-economic status, Educational level, Marital status, and Occupational life pattern. Secondly are the three Early Home Environmental Conditions, namely Physically Broken Home, Psychologically Disrupted Home, and Defective Modes of Discipline. Personality characteristics form the third set of the variables which include Socialization, self-esteem and Acting-out behaviour. Below are presented the research findings on these variables.

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

The data on which the findings of Demographic Variables are based comprise of both the samples, B and C, each having 220 and 111 subjects respectively. The result of both the data, though collected separately, are presented together. The reason being that sample C was studied, apart from other reasons, to replicate the findings of data on sample B as well. In the following are presented the results on the Demographic Variables.

Venue of Crime

It may be noted in table 32 that most of the subjects classified as Professionals more frequently committed crimes in urban locales (52 out of 69) as compared with the subjects classified as Non-professionals who predominantly committed their crimes in rural areas (140 out of 151).

Table 32

Distribution of type of Crime (latest) into Venue of Crime (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	V e n u e		Total
	Rural	Urban	
Professional	17	52	69
Non-professional	140	11	151
Total	157	63	220

$$\chi^2 = 104.10 \quad df = 1 \quad p < 0.00$$

Table 33

Distribution of type of Crime (latest) into Venue of Crime

Type of Criminal	V e n u e		Total
	Rural	Urban	
Professional	6	49	55
Non-professional	33	23	56
Total	39	72	111

$$\chi^2 = 26.00 \quad df = 1 \quad p < 0.00$$

These findings are supported by the findings on sample C. It can be seen in table 33 that 49 out of 55 subjects classified as Professional criminals committed their crimes in urban localities, and 33 out of 56 Non-professionals committed their crimes in rural areas. The chi-square analysis of differences between Professional and Non-professional criminals showed that these differences were highly significant.

These results can be seen from another angle in table 34. The mean professionalism score earned by those subjects of sample B who committed their crimes in urban localities was 3.00 whereas for those who committed their crimes in rural areas, it was only 0.21.

Table 34

Venue of Crime and mean score of Professionalness (Sample B)

Venue	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Urban	63	3.00	1.93
Rural	157	0.21	0.72
Total	220	1.00	1.74

$t = -15.63$ $df = 218$ $p < 0.00$

Table 35

Venue of Crime and mean score of Professionalness (Sample C)

Venue	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Urban	72	1.73	1.62
Rural	39	0.28	0.72
Total	111	1.15	1.54

$t = 5.32$ $df = 109$ $p < 0.00$

Similar is the case in table 35 which shows the mean professionalness scores of those subjects of sample C who committed their crimes in urban areas to be 1.73 and of those who committed their crimes in rural areas as 0.28. The 't-test' analysis of difference showed that these differences were quite significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that Professional criminals will report having committed their crimes in urban localities more frequently than Non-professional criminals is supported by the findings of this study.

Age

Table 36 shows that sample B subjects classified as Professionals had a lesser mean age at the time of commission of their first offense compared with the Non-professional criminals. The Professionals having lower mean age (25.16 years

compared with that of the Non-professionals 28.99). The difference between two types of criminals on the variable of age was statistically significant.

Table 36
Type of Criminal and mean age (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Professional	69	25.16	5.08
Non-professional	151	28.99	12.00
Total	220	1.00	1.74

$t = 2.55$ $df = 218$ $p < 0.001$

Table 37
Type of Criminal and mean age (Sample C)

Type of Criminal	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Professional	55	24.38	6.18
Non-professional	56	26.73	7.33
Total	111	1.15	1.54

$t = 1.81$ $df = 108$ $p = n.s.$

The subjects of sample C who were classified as Professionals also had a less mean age compared with those categorized as Non-professionals (compare 24.38 years with 26.73 years as shown in table 37). However, this difference was not significant according to the 't-test' of difference applied on data. Analysed in a different way similar results were found in tables 38 and 39 in which the distribution of mean professionalism score by offenders (sample B & C) of different age categories has been shown. It can be seen in table 38 that those who belong to age brackets of 19 to 28 years and then from 29 to 38, scored higher than the offenders of other age brackets. More or less similar findings are observed in table 39 with the only difference that the high scorers on professionalism scale included subjects of younger age brackets as well (14 to 18 years).

Table 38

Age and Mean Scores of Professionalness (Sample B)

Age	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
14–18	28	0.89	1.89
19–28	128	1.09	1.71
29–38	33	1.63	2.12
39–50	17	0.18	0.73
51 and above	14	0.00	0.00
Total	220	1.00	1.74

$F= 3.49$ $df= 219$ $p < 0.00$

Table 39

Age and Mean Scores of Professionalness (Sample C)

Age	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
14–18	12	1.83	2.08
19–28	69	1.32	1.50
29–38	22	0.91	1.41
39–50	8	0.43	0.79
Total	110	1.15	1.54

$F= 1.67$ $df= 109$ $p= n.s.$

The difference between age categories on the professionalness score failed to reach a significant level as regards the data on sample C. It can be observed that the hypothesis that Professional criminals' mean age will be less than that of the Non-professional criminals' mean age at the time of commission of their first offense is supported by the findings of one sample but not by the findings of the other sample.

Socio-economic Status

The distribution of socio-economic status among Professional and Non-professional criminals has been shown in tables 40 and 41 for samples B and C respectively.

Table 40

Distribution of type of Criminal into Socio-economic Status (SES) (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	S E S			Total
	Low	Low-Middle	Middle	
Professional	19	46	4	69
Non-professional	17	132	2	151
Total	36	178	6	220

$$\chi^2 = 13.66 \quad df = 2 \quad p < 0.001$$

Table 41

Distribution of type of Criminal into Socio-economic Status (SES) (Sample C)

Type of Criminal	S E S			Total
	Low	Low-Middle	Middle	
Professional	8	42	5	55
Non-professional	6	46	4	56
Total	14	88	9	111

$$\chi^2 = 2.18 \quad df = 2 \quad p = \text{n.s.}$$

It can be seen in table 40 that those classified as Professionals belonged to low socio-economic status more frequently compared with the Non-professionals. However this difference is more pronounced when we see the category of low-middle socio-economic status where the number of Professional criminals is quite less compared with Non-professional criminals (46 vs. 132). However, as regards the type of criminal and socio-economic status of subjects of sample C, there is no significant difference between Professional and Non-professional criminals as shown in table

41. In table 42, we can see that those subjects of sample B who belong to low socio-economic status have higher professionalism score compared with those who belong to low middle socio-economic status. This is true of subjects of sample C as shown in table 43, though here the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 42
SES and Mean Scores of Professionalness (Sample B)

SES	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Low	36	1.86	2.11
Low-Middle	178	0.83	1.62
Middle	6	1.33	1.37
Total	220	1.00	1.74

$F= 5.65$ $df= 219$ $p < 0.00$

Table 43
SES and Mean Scores of Professionalness (Sample C)

SES	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Low	14	1.64	1.65
Low-Middle	88	1.20	1.53
Middle	9	0.78	1.39
Total	111	1.15	1.54

$F= 0.90$ $df= 110$ $p = n.s.$

The findings of data on sample B suggest that the hypothesis that Professional criminals will come more frequently from low socio-economic status of the society is supported. However, these findings are not supported by the data on sample C where we find that Professionals do tend to belong to lower socio-economic status as compared with the Non-professionals but these differences are not statistically significant.

Educational Level

As regards the variable of educational level of Professional and Non-professional criminals, it can be seen in table 44 that though Professionals reported having received somewhat more years of schooling compared with Non-professionals, yet the 't-test' analysis of difference shows that the difference between the two categories of criminals on the variable of number of years of schooling was not statistically significant.

Table 44
Type of Criminal and Mean Years of Schooling (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Professional	69	3.33	3.97
Non-professional	151	2.95	3.86
Total	220	1.00	1.74

$t = -0.68$ $df = 218$ $p = \text{n.s.}$

Table 45
Type of Criminal and Mean Years of Schooling (Sample C)

Type of Criminal	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Professional	55	5.32	3.62
Non-professional	56	5.71	3.84
Total	111	1.15	1.54

$t = 0.55$ $df = 109$ $p = \text{n.s.}$

Similar results were found as regards the subjects of sample C classified as Professional and Non-professional criminals. Table 45 shows that Non-professionals received slightly more years of schooling but the difference between the two categories of criminals is non-significant.

As regards the professionalism score of criminals having received different levels of education, it can be seen in tables 46 and 47 that more or less equal scores of professionalism were earned by offender of three educational levels.

Table 46

Years of Schooling and Mean Scores of Professionalness
(Sample B)

Years of Schooling	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
0-4	153	1.03	1.75
5-9	40	1.15	1.93
10-14	27	0.67	1.39
Total	220	1.00	1.74

$F=0.66$ $df=219$ $p=n.s.$

Table 47

Years of Schooling and Mean Scores of Professionalness
(Sample C)

Years of Schooling	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
0-4	29	1.52	1.66
5-9	62	1.11	1.52
10-14	20	1.15	1.39
Total	111	1.15	1.54

$F=0.71$ $df=110$ $p=n.s.$

One-way analysis of variance failed to reveal any significant difference between these categories of educational levels. Therefore, the hypothesis that Professional criminals will report having received less number of years of schooling compared with Non-professional criminals is not supported by the findings.

Marital Status

The findings in table 48 indicate that those subjects of sample B who were categorized as Professional criminals were more frequently not-married at the time of commission of their first offense. It can be seen that out of a total of 69 Professional criminals, only 15 were married.

Table 48

Distribution of Type of Criminal into Marital Status (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	M a r i t a l S t a t u s		Total
	Married	Not-married	
Professional	15	54	69
Non-professional	89	62	151
Total	104	116	220

$\chi^2 = 24.82$ $df = 1$ $p < 0.00$

Table 49

Distribution of Type of Criminal into Marital Status (Sample C)

Type of Criminal	M a r i t a l S t a t u s		Total
	Married	Not-married	
Professional	18	37	55
Non-professional	30	26	56
Total	48	63	111

$\chi^2 = 4.09$ $df = 1$ $p < 0.00$

These differences between two groups of Professional and Non-professional criminals were statistically significant according to the chi-square analyses. On the

contrary, out of 151 subjects classified as Non-professionals, 89 were married. Similar results are found as regards the subjects of sample C. It can be seen in table 49 that out of 55 subjects classified as Professionals only 18 were married whereas out of 56 subjects classified as Non-professionals, 30 were married.

These findings become quite evident in tables 50 and 51 where we see Not-married scoring higher on level of professionalism scale compared with the married criminals. The not-married subjects of sample B scored 1.57 mean professionalism score whereas married scored only 0.38. The not-married subjects of sample C scored higher (1.46) than married subjects (0.92).

Table 50

Marital Status and Mean Scores of Professionalness (Sample B)

Marital Status	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Married	104	0.38	1.15
Not-married	116	1.57	1.97
Total	220	1.00	1.74

$t = 5.35$ $df = 218$ $p < 0.00$

Table 51

Marital Status and Mean Scores of Professionalness (Sample C)

Marital Status	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Married	48	0.92	1.43
Not-married	63	1.46	1.58
Total	111	1.15	1.54

$t = 1.87$ $df = 109$ $p < 0.06$

The differences between married and not-married subjects on level of professionalism score were statistically significant according to the 't-test' analysis of difference. Therefore, the hypothesis that the Professional criminals will be more frequently unmarried at the time of commission of their first offense compared with the Non-professional criminals is supported by the findings.

Occupational Life Pattern

At the end, are presented findings on the variable of Occupational Life Pattern. In table 52, it can be seen that Professional criminals more frequently reported having had a chequered occupational pattern compared with Non-professional criminals. Out of 69 subjects of sample B, 53 had chequered Occupational Life Pattern. Seen from another angle, out of 71 subjects who had chequered Occupational Life Pattern, 53 subjects were classified as Professional criminals compared with the category of those 149 criminals who had a normal Occupational Life Pattern and only 16 of them were classified as Professionals. These findings are more evident in table 53 where out of 55 Professional criminals, 41 had a chequered Occupational Life Pattern. Non-professionals had mostly a normal Occupational Life Pattern.

Table 52

Distribution of Type of Criminal into Occupational Pattern (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	Occupational Pattern		Total
	Normal	Chequered	
Professional	16	53	69
Non-professional	133	18	151
Total	149	71	220

$$\chi^2 = 88.3 \quad df = 1 \quad p < 0.00$$

Table 53

Distribution of Type of Criminal into Occupational Pattern (Sample C)

Type of Criminal	Occupational Pattern		Total
	Normal	Chequered	
Professional	14	41	55
Non-professional	47	9	56
Total	61	50	111

$$\chi^2 = 37.68 \quad df = 1 \quad p < 0.00$$

These difference between Professional and Non-professional criminals of both the samples were statistically significant too. In table 54 we can see that those who had a chequered Occupational Life Pattern scored higher on professionalism scale than those who had a normal Occupational Life Pattern (2.66 compared with 0.22 only).

Table 54

Occupational Pattern and Mean Score of Professionalness (Sample B)

Occupational Pattern	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Normal	149	0.22	0.78
Chequered	71	2.66	2.02
Total	220	1.00	1.74

$$t = 12.89 \quad df = 218 \quad p < 0.00$$

Table 55

Occupational Pattern and Mean Score of Professionalness (Sample C)

Occupational Pattern	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Normal	61	0.36	0.73
Chequered	50	2.33	1.59
Total	111	1.15	1.54

$$t = 8.61 \quad df = 108 \quad p < 0.00$$

Similar findings are reported in table 55 consisting of data on sample C. Those considered to have chequered Occupational Life Pattern scored 2.33 on level of professionalism scale compared with those having had normal Occupational Life Pattern scoring only 0.36. These differences between the two categories were statistically significant according to the 't-test'. The findings, therefore, support the hypothesis that Professional criminals will report having had a more chequered Occupational Life Pattern than Non-professional criminals.

Summary of the findings on Demographic Variables are as follows: Those subjects classified as Professional criminals committed their crimes more frequently in urban areas. They tend to be younger than the Non-professionals at the time of the commission of their first offense. They are also usually unmarried at that time and, compared with Non-professionals, more frequently have a disturbed and chequered occupational life pattern. Professional and Non-professional criminals, however, do not show any significant difference on the socio-economic status and educational level as most of the subjects were illiterates or low in education and almost all of them belonged to low socio-economic strata of the society.

EARLY HOME ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

Table 56 gives the distribution of type of criminal (i.e., subjects categorized as Professional and Non-professionals) into Physically Broken – Intact home. It is found out that from among the 69 subjects who were categorized as Professionals, 42 reported to belong to Physically broken home whereas 27 belonged to intact homes. Among those 151 subjects who were classified as Non-professionals, 63 belonged to broken homes whereas 88 belonged to intact homes.

Table 56

Distribution of Type of Criminal into Physically Broken - Intact Home
(Sample B)

Type of Criminal	Broken	Intact	Total
Professional	42	27	69
Non-professional	63	88	151
Total	105	115	220

$$\chi^2 = 6.21 \quad df = 1 \quad p < 0.01$$

Table 57

Distribution of Professionalness Score into Physically Broken-Intact Home
(Sample B)

Home	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Physically Broken	105	1.35	1.95
Physically Intact	115	0.69	1.46
Total	220	1.01	1.74

$$t = 2.84 \quad df = 218 \quad p < 0.00$$

The difference between the two categories of Professional and Non-professional criminals is significant. In table 57 we can see the same findings in a different way. It can be noted that those who belonged to physically broken homes scored 1.35 on professionalness scale whereas those who belonged to Psychologically disrupted homes scored only 0.69. The 't-test' difference among the two categories is highly significant. These findings support the first hypothesis on early home environmental variables that Professional criminals will report belonging to Physically Broken Homes more frequently than Non-professional criminals.

Findings given in table 58 indicate that Professionals more frequently belonged to psychologically disrupted homes as compared with Non-professional criminals (37 out of 69 compared with only 14 out of 151). The findings become quite pronounced when we see that an overwhelming majority of the Non-professional belonged to "Not-

disrupted" homes. The differences between Professional and Non-professional criminals was significant according to the chi-square analysis.

Table 58

Distribution of Type of Criminal into Psychologically Disrupted- Not Disrupted Home (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	Disrupted	Not-disrupted	Total
Professional	37	32	69
Non-professional	14	137	151
Total	51	169	220

$$\chi^2 = 49.85 \quad df = 1 \quad p < 0.01$$

Table 59

Distribution of Professionalness Score into Psychologically Disrupted - Not Disrupted Home (Sample B)

Home	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Disrupted	51	2.51	2.10
Not-disrupted	169	0.56	1.32
Total	220	1.01	1.74

$$t = 7.98 \quad df = 218 \quad p < 0.00$$

These findings were seen in table 59 in terms of professionalness scores of those subjects who belonged to Psychologically disrupted homes compared with those who belonged to Psychologically not-disrupted homes. It can be seen in this table that the former scored as high as 2.51 on professionalness score whereas the latter scored as low as 0.56. The difference between the two scores is highly significant according to

the 't-test' analysis of difference. These findings support the hypothesis that Professional criminal will report belonging to Psychologically Disrupted Homes more frequently than the Non-professional criminals.

As regards the Defective Modes of discipline, Table 60 shows that Professionals more frequently report having received defective modes of discipline compared with subjects categorized as Non-professional criminals (45 out of 69 compared with only 18 out of 151).

Table 60

Distribution of Type of Criminal into Defective Modes of Discipline (Sample B)

Type of Criminal	Discipline Normal	Discipline Defective	Total
Professional	24	45	69
Non-professional	133	18	151
Total	157	63	220

$\chi^2 = 63.25$ $df = 1$ $p < 0.00$

Table 61

Distribution of Professionalness Score into Modes of Discipline (Sample B)

Modes of Discipline	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Discipline Normal	157	0.46	1.22
Discipline Defective	63	2.38	2.07
Total	220	1.01	1.74

$t = -8.55$ $df = 218$ $p < 0.00$

The above finding becomes more evident, when we see that among the Non-professional criminals, majority reported having received normal modes of control and support, and only a few of them reported having received defective modes of

discipline from their parents. Seen in table 61 in which professionalism scores are distributed among those who received normal and defective modes of discipline, it becomes quite evident that those who received defective discipline from their parents scored quite high (i.e., 2.38) compared with those who reported having received normal discipline from their parents (i.e. 0.46 only). These findings support the hypothesis that Professional criminals will report having received Defective Modes of Discipline from their parents more frequently than Non-professional criminals.

Taken adverse Early Home Environmental Conditions together and converted into the Psychological Adversity Score, it can be seen in table 62 that Professionals had a mean of 1.80 Psychological Adversity Score whereas the Non-professionals had a mean score of only 0.62.

Table 62

Distribution of Psychological Adversity Scores into Type of Criminal
(Sample B)

Type of Criminal	<i>f</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Professional	69	1.80	1.04
Non-professional	151	0.62	0.74
Total	220	0.99	1.00

$t = -9.60$ $df = 218$ $p < 0.00$

These findings support the hypothesis that Professional criminals will score higher on the psychological adversity scale than Non-professional criminals.

The above findings support all the four hypotheses related to Early Home Environmental Conditions. In the third and the last section of this chapter we will see

how the two types of criminals differ from each other on defined personality characteristics.

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

The results on the personality characteristics studied, namely Socialization, Self-esteem, and Acting-out behaviour of the subjects are presented in tables 63 and 64. The subjects categorized as Professional and Non-professional criminals are compared with each other on all the three personality characteristics (see table 63).

Table 63
Distribution of Socialization, Self-esteem and Acting-out Scores in Type of Criminal (Sample C)

Scores	Type of Criminal				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Professional (N= 55)		Non-professional (N= 56)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Socialization	9.25	5.30	10.82	6.26	1.42	n.s
Self-esteem	122.82	32.11	135.39	13.09	2.71	.008
Acting-out	-0.05	1.60	-0.11	2.21	-0.14	n.s.

Table 64
Correlation between Socialization, Self-esteem, Acting-out and Professionalness Scores (Sample C)

	Socialization	Self-esteem	Acting-out	Professionalness
Socialization	-	.18	.12	.23*
Self-esteem		-	.01	.29**
Acting-out			-	.06
Professionalness				-

* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

As regards the scores on Socialization, it was found out that Non-professionals tended to score higher than the Professionals (10.82 vs 9.25), but the difference was statistically non-insignificant. The difference became pronounced only when the

correlation analysis was carried out to see the relation between Socialization scores and the level of professionalism (see table 64). A negative correlation (-.23) between the two scores was found out which was statistically significant at .05 level. This shows that higher the professionalism scores, lower are the Socialization scores. Therefore, the hypothesis that Professional criminals will score lower on Socialization scale of CPI than Non-professional criminals is supported by the findings.

The scores on Urdu Adjective Check-list (UACL) are presented in two steps. Firstly, the mean scores on Self-esteem scale have been seen as distributed among Professional and Non-professional criminals in tables 63. Secondly, ACL scores were also analysed in terms of nine scales in table 65. The results given in table 65 will be discussed shortly. As regards the Self-esteem levels of Professional and Non-professional criminals, Table 63 shows that Non-professionals scored significantly higher on Self-esteem scale than the Professional ones indicating that the Non-professionals have a higher positive Self-esteem. As the 't-test' analysis reveals that the difference between the two means is highly significant, the findings support the hypothesis of the study that Professional criminals will manifest lower Self-esteem than Non-professional criminals. The correlation analysis in table 64 also shows that there is a highly significant inverse relationship between professionalism scores and Self-esteem scores.

As regards the scores on Acting-out tendencies or dispositions of subjects, it can be seen in table 63 that, as hypothesized, Professionals scored lower than Non-professionals (-.05 vs. -.11), but statistically the difference remained non-significant. When correlation analysis were carried out to see the relationship between professionalism scores and Acting-out scores (table 64), it was revealed that there was still no significant relationship between the two personality variables. Therefore, the

hypothesis that Professional criminals will score lower on Acting-out dimension of the Hand Test, has not been supported by the findings of the present research.

Additional Analyses:

It may be noted that apart from testing of the three hypotheses formulated on Personality Characteristics, two of which have been shown above to be supported by the findings, there were some additional analyses carried out on data of sample C regarding the Self-esteem and Hand Test dimensions, and on data of sample D of Non-criminals regarding the Hand Test dimensions alone. Below are presented these analyses.

As regards the scores on other the nine scales of Adjective Check-List, Non-professionals scored higher than Professional on all the scales except on Aggression (see table 65). The 't-test' revealed that the difference between the two groups was statistically significant on eight scales.

Table 65
Distribution of Scores on ACL Scales in Type of Criminal
(Sample C)

S c a l e s	Professional (N= 55)		Non-Prof. (N= 56)		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Achievement	30.51	8.95	35.07	4.81	3.35	.001
Aggression	30.09	8.88	31.38	4.77	0.95	n.s.
Succorance	14.91	4.32	16.96	2.63	3.04	.003
Nurturance	38.45	10.41	43.23	5.27	3.06	.003
Affiliation	32.02	9.30	36.91	5.68	3.35	.001
Autonomy	19.95	5.99	23.25	3.70	3.50	.001
Intelligence	38.18	10.17	41.25	4.45	2.06	.041
Dominance	23.29	7.10	27.34	4.57	3.58	.001
Abasement	23.07	6.52	25.46	3.75	2.37	.019

On one scale, namely, 'Aggression' difference failed to reach the significance level. Correlation analyses of professionalism scores and those on ACL reveal more or less the same findings (shown in table 66).

Table 66

Correlation between Professionalness Scores and Scores on ACL Scales
(Sample C)

ACL Scales	<i>r</i>
Achievement	-.3179**
Aggression	-.0412
Succorance	-.2188
Nurturance	-.2516*
Affiliation	-.3707**
Autonomy	-.3192**
Intelligence	-.1850
Dominance	-.3487**
Abasement	-.0765

** $p < 0.01$ * $p < 0.05$

There is a significant negative relationship between the two scores on the following scales: Achievement, Nurturance, Affiliation, Autonomy, and Dominance scales. However, a non-significant inverse relationship was found out on the following scales: Aggression, Succorance, Intelligence, and Abasement.

Acting-out Scores (AOS) and other scores on the Hand Test along with statistical comparisons on each of the scoring category between Professional and Non-professional criminals have been given in table 67 and between criminals and non-criminals in table 68.

Table 67 shows that there are no significant differences between Professional and Non-professional criminals on any of the Hand Test variables.

Table 67

Distribution of Scores on Hand Test Variables into Type of Criminal (Sample C)

	Prof. Criminals (N= 120)	Non-prof. Criminals (N= 60)	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
INTERPERSONAL	2.62	2.88	0.67	n.s.
AFF	0.65	0.75	0.55	n.s.
DEP	0.25	0.20	0.64	n.s.
COM	0.36	0.43	0.46	n.s.
EXH	0.02	0.02	0.01	n.s.
DIR	0.73	0.79	0.29	n.s.
AGG	0.60	0.70	0.56	n.s.
SOCIALLY POSITIVE	1.27	1.38	0.41	n.s.
SOCIALLY NEGATIVE	1.33	1.48	0.56	n.s.
ACTING OUT SCORES (AOS)	0.05	0.11	0.14	n.s.
ENVIRONMENTAL	2.02	1.84	0.68	n.s.
ACQ	0.12	0.04	0.44	n.s.
ACT	1.75	1.48	1.12	n.s.
PAS	0.25	0.32	0.66	n.s.
MALDJUSTIVE	0.75	0.57	-1.16	n.s.
TEN	0.15	0.09	0.57	n.s.
CRIP	0.51	0.38	-1.21	n.s.
FEAR	0.18	0.11	0.78	n.s.
WITHDRAWAL	2.40	2.62	0.48	n.s.
DES	1.36	1.21	0.55	n.s.
BIZ	0.85	1.29	1.06	n.s.
FAIL	0.12	0.18	0.28	n.s.
PATHOLOGICAL	3.14	3.19	0.11	n.s.
R (TOTAL - FAIL)	9.82	9.88	0.28	n.s.

Non-professionals do tend to score higher on most of the dimensions, with one exception of ENVIRONMENTAL category where Professionals have scored higher. Non-professionals scored higher, for example, on DIR, AGG, SOCIALLY POSITIVE, and AOS dimensions of the Hand Test, but as stated above, none of the difference were statistically significant.

Though differences between two types of criminals on Hand Test variables are not statistically significant, yet the differences between criminals and non-criminals shown in table 68 indicate some interesting findings.

It can be seen in table 68 that criminals are significantly different from Non-criminals on Dependence (DEP) and Direction (DIR) categories under INTERPERSONAL dimension. On DEP, criminals scored low, whereas on DIR, they scored higher. More importantly, criminals are different from non-criminal on their Acting-out scores (AOS), Non-criminals scoring higher on this dimension than the criminals. ENVIRONMENTAL dimension shows highly significant differences between criminals and non-criminals, non-criminals scoring much higher than the criminals on all the categories. Under MALADJUSTIVE dimension, the only category which shows significant difference is that of FEAR, on which criminals have scored higher. On all the other dimension and their categories the differences are non-significant.

Table 68

Distribution of Scores on Hand Test Variables in Groups of Criminals (Sample C) and Non-criminals (Sample D)

	Criminals (N= 120)	Non- Criminals (N= 60)	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
INTERPERSONAL	2.75	2.00	-0.06	n.s.
AFF	0.70	0.07	0.02	n.s.
DEP	0.23	0.50	-2.35	0.02
COM	0.40	0.42	-0.17	n.s.
EXH	0.03	0.02	-0.63	n.s.
DIR	0.76	0.47	1.86	0.06
AGG	0.65	0.65	-0.01	n.s.
SOCIALLY POSITIVE	1.32	1.62	-1.27	n.s.
SOCIALLY NEGATIVE	1.41	1.12	1.35	n.s.
ACTING OUT SCORES (AOS)	0.08	0.50	-1.90	0.05
ENVIRONMENTAL	1.93	5.07	-	0.00
ACQ	0.03	0.87	-7.44	0.00
ACT	1.61	3.33	-7.64	0.00
PAS	0.29	0.87	-4.25	0.00
MALADJUSTIVE	0.66	0.70	-0.28	n.s.
TEN	0.07	0.12	-0.82	n.s.
CRIP	0.44	0.57	-0.97	n.s.
FEAR	0.14	0.02	1.93	0.05
WITHDRAWAL	2.51	2.88	-0.98	n.s.
DES	1.29	1.53	-1.13	n.s.
BIZ	1.07	1.23	-0.49	n.s.
FAIL	0.15	0.12	0.26	n.s.
PATHOLOGICAL	3.17	3.58	-1.11	n.s.
R (TOTAL -FAIL)	9.85	9.88	-0.26	n.s.

Summary of results consisting of significant differences between criminals and non-criminals is as follows: criminals scored higher than non-criminals on DIR and FEAR. Non-criminals scored higher than criminals on DEP, AOS, ACQ, ACT, PAS (last three categories belonging to ENVIRONMENTAL dimension).

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings of the study establish that convicts in Pakistani prisons can be grouped into two broad categories and labelled as Professional and Non-professional criminals on the basis of certain offense and offender related variables. Apart from demonstrating differences on these Classifying Variables, the two types of criminals are shown to be different from each on a number of Demographic Variables, Early Home Environmental Conditions and personality characteristics as well. The findings have been discussed below followed by the conclusions drawn from these findings.

Firstly, it has been seen that the conceptualization of a Professional criminal, compared with his Non-professional counterpart, stems from the folk concept that criminals are of different types. The folk concept of a Professional criminal is based on such variables like Type of Crime, Past Criminal Record, Relationship with the Victim, Premeditation, and Criminal Associations. Furthermore, there is a good deal of agreement regarding the definition and description of a Professional criminal as postulated in the present research at one hand, and as perceived by the layman as well as experts belonging to law-enforcing agencies on the other. The profile of a Professional criminal which emerges as the result of findings is as follows: A professional criminal is a person who frequently commits illegal acts of various nature. He is usually without any regular and legitimate source of income. Criminal activities being main source of living for him, he mostly commits a variety of non-violent property crimes. At times, however, he may hurt or murder someone particularly when his intended offense against property is checked or thwarted in such a way that he fears failure and the likely arrest. He mostly commits his crime in

non-personal situations and his victims are mostly strangers to him. He usually commits crimes with planning. He is a recidivist and usually has association with those who themselves practice criminal behaviour.

The other profile we get from the findings is that of a Non-professional. He is perceived as a person who mostly commits crimes like hurt and murder in interpersonal situations, and his victims are usually his relatives or at least they are known to him. He mostly commits crime in a spur of a moment. However, at times he may plan his offense. He is usually not a recidivist but even if there is some previous arrest or/and conviction, it is usually in connection with a violent illegal act against person and not against property. He does not have close association with those who practice criminal ways of life.

The above described contrasting profiles of Professional and Non-professional criminals imply that differences among criminals are perceived by the laymen as they distinguish between hardened, habitual or Professional criminal at one hand, and the occasional, non-habitual, or Non-professional criminals on the other. The findings, thus, tend to be in accord with earlier ones that important perceived differences do exist among different types of crimes as regards their nature and etiology (Hollin & Howells, 1987).

The conception of a Professional criminal as postulated in the present study may, however, be somewhat different from what a Professional criminal is thought to be in some other societies. Gibbons (personal communication, December, 1989), for example, observes:

In the American criminological literature, the notion of professional criminal usually is applied to individuals who not only have engaged in

repetitive law-breaking, but persons who work full-time at crime and who exhibit a high degree of skill at crime.

A Pakistani Professional criminal is not likely to be very different from his American counterpart as crime repetitiveness is one of the basic factors in both of them. Still a Pakistani Professional criminal may not be working full-time at crime. It is quite likely that he may not have any legitimate job for quite a long time, and may have a chequered history as far as legal occupations are concerned. However, many may be doing some job, at least 'to show' that they have some legal occupation to do. Moreover, the Pakistani Professional thieves and burglars, etc., may not exhibit that high a degree of skill at crime which their American counterparts are likely to possess because of the obvious differences in the levels of technological advancements and socio-economic conditions of the two countries. Criminal activities of a Professional criminal may also not be very organized. However, what is likely to be common between a Pakistani Professional criminal and an American Professional criminal is a disposition to engage continuously in anti-social, illegal and unscrupulous activities with individual differences in the extent and nature of such activities.

After having demonstrated that people perceive two types of criminals differently, and that these differences are based mainly on the Classifying Variables included in the study, the research proceeds to test empirically the classification by way of sorting sampled prisoners into the two groups. Most of the prisoners found in the Pakistani jails are classifiable into the two proposed categories, i.e., Professional and Non-professional criminals. There were sundry other offenders in the samples of this study who were not classified in terms of Professional and Non-professional criminals. It was difficult to do so according to the definitions and criterion of Type of Crime described in the present research. Army desertion and violation of price,

weights and measures regulations, etc. are examples of such cases. However, the number of these crimes was too small to warrant any consideration whatsoever.

Analyzing the nature of criminal acts, Professional and Non-professional commit, it is found out that the criminal acts committed by the convicted prisoners are predominantly three, namely, Violence against person (murder and serious hurt, etc.), Property offenses (with or without violence), and Sexual offenses.

The findings suggest that Professional criminals who are predominantly Property offenders had more frequently committed a property offense in the past too, and those subjects who were convicted for violence against person for their latest offense had more frequently committed a violent act previously as well, if at all they had committed any. In fact, the Non-professionals who mostly commit violence against person are likely to be non-recidivists. Even if they indulge in some illegal act again in life, it is more frequently murdering or hurting some one. This is because of the old and persistent enmities between the rival groups in rural areas of Pakistan (Kanwar, 1989; Tariq & Durrani, 1983). The disputes on land and other issues related to agricultural activities, the complex matrimonial and women-related affairs, and other scuffles and brawls among simple and uneducated people of the country-side lead many of them to crimes of murdering and injuring seriously. Once a murder or hurt takes place, an unending chain of murder and hurts ensues because people harbour grudges and enmities and value high the tradition of taking revenge. Therefore people may get involved repeatedly in illegal acts of violence.

At times, it is assumed that by virtue of having spent a long time in the prison, some of the Non-professionals might as well 'learn', so to speak, the 'criminal ways of life', and may, eventually become 'Professional criminals'. While testing such a hypothesis, a host of intervening variables such as the age at the commission of first offense, nature of experience in the prison and outside the prison after release, and

other such social Psychological factors would be important to study as these are likely to have their differential influence.

It may be observed here that to expect a consistency in the nature of criminal acts among criminals is not only unrealistic (as it is not found among the real life offenders), it is unnecessary also. Consistency in the specific nature of criminal acts an individual may commit in his life time cannot be expected because there are countless such acts which can be committed by him. However, if the broad types of criminals could be identified regardless of what specific illegal acts they commit, it would be much more useful, theoretically as well as practically, than trying in futility to fit the offenders in countless pigeon-holes of criminal acts.

It seems that type of crime is a major determinant of a criminal being judged as "Professional" or "Non-professional" which in turn means that most property offenders are likely to be judged as Professionals whereas most murderers and assaultists are going to be considered Non-professionals. We have seen that the number of subjects judged as Professional or Non-professional turned out to be more or less equal among the subjects of sample C which was a stratified sample according to the type of crime. One may, therefore, argue that type of crime alone may suffice as a variable on the basis of which criminals could be classified and perhaps a better labelling of the two types would be "property offenders" and "Violent Offenders" which would also be more acceptable to those who are familiar with legal terminologies and systems of classification. Nevertheless, the present classification's basic point is to avoid crime specificity which would be implied if the two categories of criminals are called violent offenders and property offenders, as the former would include only crimes of murder, assault, etc. and the latter would include the crimes against property alone.

The present researcher further contends that for a meaningful causal analysis of criminal behaviour, it is more appropriate to study the criminals and the social-psychological factors associated with them rather than studying what types of criminal acts they commit. Moreover, judgement of criminals should not be based only on one variable, such as type of crime, but other offense and offender related variables are also important to consider before deciding whether or not an individual is a habitual and Professional criminal. The findings of the present study have indicated the importance of such variables. Past Criminal Record and Relationship with the Victim are, for example, important factors which distinguish well between the two proposed categories. The correlation analysis carried out to see relationship between Classifying Variables also indicated that a subject judged Professional, on one variable was likely to be judged so on an other variable too. This only shows that there is close relationship between the Classifying Variables and these help in distinguishing a Professional criminal from a Non-professional one.

Therefore, on the basis of above, it may be observed that a meaningful categorization of criminals should be based on a number of variables and not only on type of crime. Moreover, it does not matter what labels are given to the categories obtained. Our Professional criminals could be termed as recidivists (repeaters) or habituals and our Non-professional criminals might as well be called "one-time losers", or "Non-habitual" criminals. The present researcher, however, contends that Professional and Non-professional labels are well-suited particularly when the categories are not crime-specific and are based on a number of relevant variables rather than being based on any one of them. Moreover, these labels are quite close to the lay-persons' usage of language when they describe the "Professional" and "Non-professional" criminals.

As regards the evolving of a typology based on the Classifying Variables of the present research it seems quite improbable. Despite the fact that a majority of the

convicted prisoners could be classified in the two broad categories of Professional and Non-professional criminals, the Classifying Variables did not neatly classify the convicts into Professional and Non-professional criminals. To illustrate, convicts who were judged "Professional" on the basis of say Type of Crime were not necessarily judged as "Professional" on the basis of, for example, Premeditation or Criminal Association. Thus the present study tends to confirm earlier findings that usually there is a great deal of disagreement observed between certain typological claims and empirical observations (see, for example, Gibbons, 1979; Hartjen & Gibbons, 1969; McKenna, 1972,).

It seems that the kind of a classification scheme proposed in this study can hardly meet Gibbons's (1985) or any other similar criteria of evaluating an offender typology. In fact, it seems futile to develop typology of criminals expected to yield mutually exclusive types in which each incumbent (offender) could be placed only in one type according to each one of the Classifying Variables. This does not seem probable particularly as long as these remain offense-specific in any manner.

In the limited context of the Pakistani prisons, the Classifying Variables included in this study help identify two groups having some theoretical and practical value. It may be noted that the variables are offense-related (not offense-specific), operationally definable and, hence, objectively scorable. None of these is of etiological nature. One may argue, as stated earlier, that Past Criminal Record may contribute to the development of a Professional criminal. However, the variable has more of an identification value differentiating Professional from the Non-professional criminals than having any invariant etiological significance. Thus, the classification which the variables yield has only a heuristic value and can not have any typological claims. It seems relevant only to a limited segment of total prison population in Pakistan. It does not preclude other types of criminals which might be found among the general population.

Professional and Non-professional Criminals and other Offender Typologies:

Two broad but distinct groups of criminals described as Professional and Non-professional criminals in the present research seem to have resemblance of character and behaviour with criminals described in various typologies by other researchers. Tracing as far back as Mayhew and Moreau's (cited in Lindesmith and Dunham, 1956) works, they divided criminals into two broad categories "Professional" and the "Casual". Their "Professional" category comprising of "basically dishonest" individuals resembles closely with our conceptualization of the Professional criminals and their descriptions of "Casual" offenders share many characteristics with our Non-professional group of criminals.

Similarly, Lindesmith and Dunham's (1956) own descriptions of a "social criminal" is not very different from our group of "Professionals" whereas most of our Non-professionals belong to the group of criminals whose crimes have been described by them as "Individualized crime". Here it may be noted that the "social-individual" continuum described by Lindesmith and Dunham to identify criminals at any point in-between, can be assumed to exist also between the Professional and Non-professional criminals. However, the heterogeneity or diversity found in criminal behaviour and the crime switching observed among criminals defy all efforts towards developing a typology of any fixed or non-flexible nature. We can not, for example, say that an "individual" criminal would never become a "social" criminal, or a "social" criminal would not be committing any crime at the individual and personal level.

Another related point here is that some of the earlier "typologists" like Lindesmith and Dunham, tried to condense their typologies dumping diverse types of crimes into either "social" or towards the "individual" end of the continuum. Although sometimes later, Clinard (1968) and Clinard and Quinney (1973) tried to do away with this condensation by suggesting a more comprehensive typology, yet the

heterogeneity of behaviour was so immense that all types of criminal acts could hardly be covered. Clinard and Quinney described a criminal career progressing from Occasional Property Offender to Occupational Property Offender, and still further to Organized and Professional criminals. These types might resemble our "Professional" group of criminals though it will be unrealistic to think that Clinard and Quinney's descriptions of Organized and Professional criminals would be similar to that of Professional criminal described in the present research in context of the inmates of Pakistani prisons.

The broad category of a predatory criminal is discernible in Gibbons' (1968) descriptions of role career of a few types of property offenders. These descriptions resemble closely the conceptualization of a "Professional" criminal. Gibbons (1987) observes:

The collection of life experiences beginning with petty delinquent episodes of gang members in slum areas exemplifies an offender career. With advancing age, this career line leads into more systematic involvement in utilitarian thefts, and still later it culminates in a sustained pattern of adult episodes of property crimes interrupted by periodic prison terms (p211-212).

This is clearly the description of one specific type of criminal whose predominant role or way of life is committing criminal acts. The salient features of his criminality include type of crime, (which is mostly predatory in nature), frequency of its commission, (which is likely to be quite repetitive), and then is the skill with which he executes his criminal acts and which usually increases gradually. Nevertheless, all these variables still may vary from one episode to the other with varying probabilities, and hence can hardly become the basis of a typology. The only factors which may indicate towards a type of criminal is the motive, intentions

or/and behavioural dispositions to obtain unlawful monetary gains from others' property and possession.

Thus, to say that there are any clear-cut patterns of certain variables which consistently and invariably relate to specific types of criminals would be unrealistic. The previous research has failed to provide empirical verification of most typological efforts. Moreover, consistency is one thing that cannot be predicted with much precision. Some delinquent pattern may grow in adult criminality, other may not. And then there are developmental changes in offense patterns at times starting with minor offenses in early adolescence and gradually increasing in seriousness as the time passes. Therefore, it is only the broad way of life or type of criminal which is identifiable and not the specific relevant details. The way of life of a Professional criminal as formulated in this study is that he continuously commits various types of property crimes for varying extent of monetary gains.

The conceptualization of a Professional and Non-professional criminal can be seen in the light of the findings of a series of studies conducted by Rand Corporation which taken together, have thrown a great deal of light on the question of behavioural regularities and types to be found among criminals. Among these studies the one conducted by Peterson, Braker and Polich (1980) concluded that among the prisoners are found two kinds of offenders: "Occasional criminals" and "broadly active ones". The Professional criminals as conceptualized in this study are in fact close to "the broadly active ones" and the Non-professionals could be mostly the "occasional" ones. Though in Peterson et al.'s (1980) study there were few career specialists as frequent crime switching was observed among the sample of prisoners, yet this could be because of the fact that the researchers did not record the broad spheres or types of crimes within which their subjects might have been switching their crimes. Property offenses, for example, could be one broad type within which one might find crime switching a great deal: A pickpocket indulging in theft this time, a robbery the next.

But it is far less likely, though not altogether improbable, that the crime switching would be frequent across certain broad types. A murderer, particularly the one who kills in an interpersonal situation is not likely to commit theft, indulge in smuggling, or rob someone on the high-way. If at all he repeats his crime, it is likely that he would indulge again in violence against person in an interactional situation. Among Professionals, on the other hand, the probability of committing a property offense repetitively would continue to remain high. Further research, however, would be needed to see the crime patterns among repeaters. It can be only conjectured here that Non-professionals are less likely to commit those crimes which are usually committed by the Professionals whereas Professionals might commit, at times, those crimes (violence, etc.) which are peculiarly committed by Non-professionals. But obviously, the reasons behind these acts would be different. Where Professional criminals' motivations and intentions remain directed towards unlawful gains of property and money, Non-professionals commit mostly unplanned crimes in some provocative situations.

The question of etiological significance and theoretical meaningfulness of groupings of convicted prisoners into the proposed categories, namely Professional and Non-professional criminals is addressed to by way of comparing these types on a number of factors of social-psychological significance. The findings have partially supported the assumptions that the each of the suggested types comprises of a homogeneous group of offenders manifesting similarities on Demographic Variables, background conditions and personality characteristics. In the pages to follow, the findings on these factors have been discussed.

Social-Psychological Profile of Professional and Non-professional Criminals

Demographic Variables

The findings on demographic variable indicate that most of crimes of murders and serious hurts (violence against person), take place usually in rural areas. We know

that violence against person in the villages of Pakistan is committed by otherwise law-abiding individuals in interpersonal situations replete with disputes, conflicts, brawls, and enmities (Kanwar, 1989; Tariq & Durrani, 1983). Moreover, inefficiency of and malpractices in government departments particularly the ones responsible for regulating, controlling and administering agricultural and other farming activities, and a complete dissatisfaction with the fairness and effectiveness of law enforcing agencies in the country could also be considered responsible for the most crimes in Pakistan.

Professional criminals mostly committing property offenses are found mainly in cities. They start their criminal activities relatively at an early age. They are mostly illiterates and having a chequered occupational history, perhaps they find the crime careers more satisfying than doing laborious menial jobs as being illiterate and untrained for any profession they are not capable of getting any other job. However, the findings of this study do not suggest any significant differences between Professional and Non-professional criminals as regards the variables of education and socio-economic status.

It may be observed here that in Pakistani prisons there is an overwhelming majority of those prisoners who belong to low socio-economic strata of the society. Most of the statistics from the Western World also indicate that crime does appear concentrated in areas of low income and low social status, (Burt, 1944; Glueck & Glueck, 1934; Healy, 1915; Healy & Bronner, 1926; Reckless, 1967; Taft & England, 1964). The same studies also reveal that among the population of convicts, most frequently are found those who belong to low socio-economic classes. However, most of these studies tend to conclude that poverty in itself cannot be called the prime condition leading to delinquency and crime, as in the affluent groups crimes are equally frequent. Moreover, it is necessary to be aware of the fact that economically unsuccessful is apt to find himself caught in the meshes of law. We have to note the

handicaps which the poor man faces when his illiteracy and lower class status add to suspicion of his guilt. The same determines his greater likelihood to be arrested, tried, convicted, punished and retained in the jail. Poverty is what perhaps makes it more difficult for him to secure a bail and engage a lawyer. It is again the poverty which exposes him disproportionately to the demoralizing influences of the jail. Often poverty and lack of his parents' or family's resources prevent his criminal charge from being reduced. These disadvantages of the poor man are very real in spite of the sincere efforts of our best judges to provide even-handed justice and occasionally to show sympathy for the poor man. Nevertheless, these selective factors are at least real enough to justify the relationship of low economic status and low educational level to crime.

The earlier research findings (Schafer, 1976; Sutherland & Cressy, 1955) that being married is a deterrent to crime are supported by the findings of the present study as far as "Professional" criminals are concerned. As regards the Non-professional criminals this factor does not seem to be relevant as the pressures of the social and cultural practices are quite overriding. Then, being married and having a family perhaps expose the individual to those interpersonal situations where committing crimes of murder and other sorts of violence increase somewhat as certain situations, like a family member being dishonoured or hurt in some way, "socially demand" an action which may run counter to the legal dictates of the society.

Early Home Environmental Conditions

The findings of the present study indicate that the criminals who were defined as Professionals more frequently belonged to Physically Broken and Psychologically disrupted homes in their early lives than those who were identified as Non-professional criminals. Furthermore, these are the Professionals who more frequently receive defective modes of discipline from their parents compared with

Non-professional criminals. Taken all the three variables together and deriving a Psychological Adversity Score in a simple additive manner, we observed that Professionals had a much higher mean adversity score as compared to the Non-professional criminals.

It seems that psychologically adverse conditions included in the present study relate only to the development of Professional criminal behaviour. We will discuss shortly how the adverse early home conditions could contribute to the development of a Professional criminal. Here it may be hypothesized that some of the highly Professional criminals identified in the present study may manifest psychopathology of some sort. This is being suggested as some of the criteria employed for identification of these criminals seem similar to those used in diagnostic instruments such as Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (1980). We have noticed that the family lives of the Professional criminals were unstable. In further research, it may be demonstrated that such individuals are, for example, free from guilt or remorse on their transgressions, insensitive to the needs of others, impulsive and capable of unfeeling actions as psychopaths in most cases are found to be (see, for example, Reid, 1985).

Finally, the findings of this study on Early Home Environmental Conditions should be tested further using more refined measures of 'Psychological Adversity', than the ones used in this study. Here, convicts mostly relied on their memory and reported through retrospection whether or not they were exposed to certain Psychologically Adverse Conditions in their lives. The likely problems of this type of a measure are too obvious to be stressed here (see, for example, Halverson, 1988; McCrae & Costa, 1988). It is also suggested that Professional and Non-professional criminals as defined in this study should be tested on some other projective tests and psychiatric and clinical diagnostic criteria of psychopathy with

the view to differentiate between those etiological processes which operate in their making.

Personality Characteristics:

The findings of the present study indicate that, Professional criminals are less "socialized" than Non-professional criminals. Moreover, Professional criminals had lower Self-esteem than the Non-professional subjects. However, the findings do not support the hypothesis of this study that Non-professionals would be more aggressive (Scoring high on Acting-out dimension of the Hand Test) than Professional criminals. We will shortly discuss how the poor Socialization and low Self-esteem could contribute, in an interactive manner, to the development of the behaviour of a Professional criminal. However, it may be observed here that if the criminal behaviour is indicative of a lacking in the ability to role-take (to be able to see what the other's view is) the validity of Gough's (1960) Socialization scale is further established by the findings of this study. As stated earlier, Gough (1960) claimed that those scoring low on the scale would tend to be anti-social and deviant whereas well socialized (scoring high on the scale) would be respectable, law-abiding, and trustworthy individuals of the society occupying positions of repute. As there are significant differences between Professional and Non-professional criminals on the Socialization scale, the Non-professionals scoring higher, we can only assume that the profile of Non-professional might resemble with that of "normals" (non-criminals) as far as Socialization is concerned. Further research is needed involving comparable samples of non-criminals to test such a hypothesis.

Judging the research evidence on the nature of Self-esteem among criminals in the light of the findings of this study, it may be observed that most of the earlier studies failed to find any consistent relationship between Self-esteem and criminality (see relevant research reviewed in chapter 2 under 'variables'), perhaps because the

offender types were usually not given any consideration while studying Self-esteem among them. The present study finds out that Professionals have lower Self-esteem than the Non-professional criminals. As expected and hypothesized the Non-professional criminal subjects of this study do not have low Self-esteem. They also have a "normal" personality profile on Classifying Variables, Early Home Environmental Conditions, and other Personality Characteristics included in the study. The Professional criminal subjects, on the other hand, have lower levels of Self-esteem perhaps because they are the ones whose socialization has been poor, and who have seen different kinds of adversities in their lives. It is quite possible that their inferiority feelings might have caused them to drift towards criminality through a psychological process which we will be shortly discussing.

Though no specific hypotheses were formulated on the ten scales derived in terms of Murray's (1965) theory of needs, yet some of the findings on these scales are quite interesting. The low scores by Professionals on Abasement compared with those of Non-professionals are quite significant. Professional criminals are the ones who have seen adverse circumstances in their lives and may be fully aware of the fact that they are looked down upon by the society at large. Repeated encounters with law-enforcing agencies and the humiliation they face at the hands of police, etc. may leave upon their minds enduring scars. If this is so, then such individuals are quite likely to develop feelings of abasement and inferiority and the low Self-esteem. Non-professional subjects' high scores on such dimensions like Achievement, Succorance, Nurturance, Affiliation, Autonomy, Dominance and Intelligence are quite revealing and may generate hypotheses regarding their personalities. At this stage, we can only conjecture that their personality profiles on these and similar characteristics may resemble that of Normal (non-criminal) subjects. Further research is required before any of these hypotheses could be supported.

The findings of the study do not support the hypothesis that Non-professional criminals will score higher on Acting-out dimension of the Hand Test than the Professionals. In fact, the violent persons who assault or/and kill are expected to be more aggressive and impulsive than the ones who steal and rob. They did score higher than the Professional criminals on Acting-out, and other related dimensions such as Direction and Aggression but the difference remained statistically non-significant.

The probable reason for this lack of a statistically significant differences between the two types of criminals could be the overall influence of the jail atmosphere. The very fact that Non-professional criminals whose personality profile is otherwise more positive than the Professional ones, were perhaps affected by "mental shock" of their own illegal violent act and subsequent physical and mental hardships they were facing inside the prison. It seems that the predicament which they faced in their lives in the form of their criminal act, and the ensuing humiliations might have depressed them a lot and "tamed" their impulsive tendencies and the aggressive "stance" in life. Their acting-out tendencies might have been subdued because of the suppressive prison atmosphere. These circumstances are assumed to be not affecting Professionals who are not expected to be impulsive, rather cool and careful in calculating the risks, and not likely to be easily affected by the prison atmosphere as they may be used to its effects. Moreover, they may be managing and directing their anger or aggression in their predatory criminal activities, and hence their tendency to act-out may remain subdued. Nevertheless, they may still have a low Self-esteem, reproaching themselves for what they are – a fact which is evidenced by their low scores on Self-esteem and high scores on Abasement scale of Adjective Check-list.

These findings lead us to observe that although behavioural tendencies projected on to the Hand Test cards are expected to be manifested in actual life situations, yet environmental conditions should not be ignored. Wagner (1983) himself observes:

These same individuals, imprisoned, can be expected to be less overtly violent (perhaps at the expense of psychological frustration) not because of the altered personality structures but because their present environment is not conducive to such behaviour. Success and failure, satisfaction and dissatisfaction, are part of the environmental situation as well as personality structure. Interpretation of the Hand Test without regard to the environmental influences is diagnostically hazardous (p. 5).

Criminals on the whole have showed some interesting differences when their scores on Hand Test Variables were compared with those of non-criminals. For example, criminals are more directive (high on DIR) and are less dependent (low on DEP). Considering these two scores together, it may be observed that the criminals are the ones who would accomplish goals by domination and control. Wagner (1983) observes that "directive people view the world as needing to be manipulated and arranged..." (p. 19). Criminals, whether Professional or Non-professional, both would fit well in this perspective as Professionals might try to manipulate and arrange the world to possess something illegally, whereas Non-professionals might like to see "people" under their control, and behave aggressively if their expectations do not come true.

The low dependency scores by criminals could be interpreted in terms of their "directive" nature. They are the ones who are not willing to subordinate themselves. Wagner (1983) observes that Dependency responses are considered to be socially positive. Criminals' low score on dependency is thus understandable as one can not expect socially positive behaviour from them.

Environmental responses which are much higher among our Non-criminal subjects indicate that compared with criminals, the former are more willing to put forth the effort to meet their environmental goals. Incarcerated individuals are not

expected to have any willingness to work, exert and try, or even be concerned with environmental activities. Most of them are on forced labour and are just 'marking-the-time'. Hence their lack of interest in prison environment is understandable.

Interesting is to note that criminals' interpersonal responses are more than their environmental responses whereas it is the other way round among non-criminals who score low on INTERPERSONAL than on ENVIRONMENTAL. Wagner (1983) observes that slightly greater number of Interpersonal responses was found in the normative group. We can explain our discordant results by assuming that where prisoners are disinterested in the 'physical' environment, they are not disinterested in "persons". They look forward to receive visitors from outside the prison and try to develop friendly contacts inside the prison, so that their lives in the prison are eased out a bit. The fact that they score higher on FEAR tells us that they do feel insecure and fearful inside the prison. In such a state of mind they might not be interested in the impersonal world (their low scores on ENVIRONMENT show they are not). However, they continue to be interested in 'persons' as their coping strategies and survival are linked more with persons and not with physical activities in the environment.

Non-criminals predominant interest in environmental activities rather than interpersonal relations could be partly due to the fact that most of them were tested in work situations. It may be recalled here that Non-criminals sample was matched with criminals on such Demographic Variables as Sex, Age, SES, and Educational level, but the one very important difference remained between them was that whereas criminals were living in an environment in which they could hardly be interested, non-criminals were actively busy in their environment when they were tested on Hand Test. Most of them are drivers, very low paid waiters in the restaurants, peons in the offices, and chowkidars (watchmen) in the houses. Their interest in their environment is evident. It should be particularly noted that their high scores on ENVIRONMENTAL dimension is mainly because of their score on Activity (ACT)

dimension and not because of Acquisition (ACQ) scores. Wagner (1983) observes that Acquisition differs from Active In that the goal is perceived as difficult or distant. Obviously our non-criminal subjects were those who were performing their normal day-to-day duties without having any distant or difficult tasks to perform. In fact they agreed to act as subjects also as a gesture of their dutiful attitude towards the tester showing that they were efficient and active in their jobs.

The above observations further strengthen the fact that Hand Test is quite good at revealing the immediate psychological state of mind as it portrays the individual as he or she is at present, not as the testee was or could be. Therefore, our Non-professional criminal subject could eventually be still more impulsive and more aggressive than the Professional subjects, but the prison atmosphere might have made them temporarily subdued and less aggressive. The differences between criminals and non-criminals are also interpretable less in terms of some deep rooted personality dispositions and more with reference to the environmental conditions in which the two groups operate and were living when tested. It seems correct that Hand Test could be most effective as a versatile clinical adjunct (Wagner,1983) but perhaps not as a research tool, particularly when used alone.

The findings of this study on personality characteristics should be interpreted carefully in the sense that being ex-post-facto, the study cannot claim to have investigated personality and other variables as causal factors. It is obviously difficult to conclude whether a person's low levels of Socialization and lower Self-esteem are related somehow or the other with his criminal behaviour in a causal way, or his such personality characteristics have resulted from his criminality and incarceration. The only thing which can be concluded from the findings of this study is that Professional criminals are different from Non-professional criminals, the former having lower levels of Socialization and Self-esteem than the latter.

Development of a Professional Criminal

The findings of this study have important theoretical considerations. These suggest that a Professional criminal is exposed to a number of adverse conditions and circumstances in life and may develop some undesirable personality characteristics as a result. For example, the specific findings on the Demographic Variables indicate that a Professional criminal found in the Pakistani prisons is quite a poor person, uneducated and having a disturbed Occupational Life Pattern as far as lawful occupations are concerned. Apart from being exposed to physical and economic hardships, the findings on Early Home Environmental Conditions indicate that a Professional criminal is exposed to psychological adversities of life as well such as belonging to a broken home, or having parents who treat each other badly (Psychological Disruption at Home) or/and treat the child in an undesirable manner (Defective Modes of Discipline).

Thus, the combination of poverty and adverse circumstances seem significant for crime etiology. But the total picture of research evidence may not permit us to attach great importance to poverty alone as being a direct cause of crime. However, the attention should be paid to unsatisfactory and unhealthy human relationships that usually flow from destitute and poverty stricken homes. Poverty, no doubt, leads to slums and poor home conditions. Inadequacy, frustration, emotional insecurity, illiteracy are naturally the fate of poor homes. Moreover, poverty and destitute cannot inspire socially acceptable behaviour, especially when the deprived, poor, and frustrated young individuals are exposed to comparative affluence around them. They may built up a resentment and feel that they can never hope to obtain such comforts. Tappan (1960), for example, argues that the poor cannot achieve their wants legitimately, and they may seize what they cannot or will not earn. He further observes that it is among the least competent in natural ability or training that competition is most difficult and criminality most frequent.

There are other psychological aspects of physically broken and psychologically disrupted homes. Emotional tensions caused by adverse circumstances early in life may lead to the development of a sense of non-affiliation or non-belonging in the individual. As the normal family set-up is a special asset to the developing child, any break, physical or psychological, in his home life is likely to deprive the child of this very important psychological feeling. Apart from providing the individual with a sense of security, a normal socialization process taking place in a psychologically healthy home may give an individual a positive self-concept and regard for others' feelings and rights. Taft and England (1964) for example, observe that if an individual's socialization at home has been on the right line, it is quite likely that he would develop socially healthy relationships outside the family too. They further observe that one's sense of self-worthiness is also based on reassurances resulting from sustained (and healthy) social ties. Thus, in an individual who has had normal interaction with the family at home, a resistance against change of moral and normative values is likely to have developed. Furthermore, a healthy and positive life is imperative for the social development as it gives the individual a sense of belonging to a group which is law abiding and imparts in him a regard for the norms of the society. Therefore, some criminal behaviour particularly that of a habitual or Professional criminal may be attributed to certain adversities experienced in life.

The development of a Professional criminal may be viewed in the context of Sutherland and Cressey's (1955) theory of differential association and Aker's (1985) social-learning and reinforcement perspectives. These theories suggest that criminal behaviour is learned in interaction with other persons who themselves practice criminal behaviour or/and have criminalistic attitudes and beliefs. It is the close associations with such persons and resultant isolation from the law-abiding group which teach individuals "definitions" (attitudes and beliefs) favourable to violation of law. Now this contact or association may be available at home and individuals may learn criminal behaviour, like many other behaviours, from their parents. The

parents who themselves effort to have monetary gains, material possessions and other achievements through fair and foul means, and the parents who encourage their children to engage in such behaviours which bring them and the family some undeserving and illegal gains, could prove to be effective models of learning of immoral and uncruplous behaviour.

However, the criminalistic associations may be established outside the home as well. It is quite probable that the unpleasant experiences which are common in physically broken and psychologically disrupted homes may repulse an individual from there and motivate him to seek the fulfilment of many deprivations outside the home usually by associating himself with a subculture of delinquents and criminals (see, for example, Akers, 1985; Shoham, 1964; Sutherland & Cressey, 1955). Gang and criminal associations, though inadequately, yet sufficiently satisfy the basic psychological needs to belong to somebody and have a feeling of worth of one's own.

Here one may look at the development of a low Self-esteem which also seems to drift many individuals to criminality. The hypothesis of this study that Professional criminals will manifest a low Self-esteem than Non-professionals is based on the assumption that the individuals with positive Self-esteem would not 'need' to behave in a manner which is not sanctioned or approved by the society. The Professional criminals, on the other hand, may try to prove their worth by doing something which is important for them and their friends. The individual who is repulsed from broken and unhappy home and comes in contact with delinquent or criminal group is likely to inherit a low self-concept from situations prevalling in his disorganized home, adverse circumstances, and other unhappy encounters with life. But soon he may find that there are ways to assert and be important and 'useful'. As a child he might have failed to get a sense of 'being' through constructive ways; but now as an adult he tries to achieve recognition and place in some negative manner. Affiliation with a gang may satisfy many of his psychological needs. It may provide him with a life full of activity.

It may give him security in a dangerous world. It may provide protection against punishment threatened by police. The gang is thus a source of friendship for persons who may not have friends otherwise. Indeed some of the very personality traits which hindered success elsewhere are great assets to a gang. Rowdiness, senseless hitting, daring risk-taking and other such characteristics may bring disapproval at home, but approval and appreciation in the gang.

But despite the individuals' efforts to achieve sense of worth and importance through socially negative ways, the low Self-esteem may persist. Gradually, one may start living up to the image of self inherited from disorganized homes and adversities of life. One's self-image of being worthless, inadequate, bad and criminal may get so deep rooted that social norms, legal controls or any amount of social pressures may not deter the individual from actualization of the self-image. The time may come in his life, when stealing, hoodwinking, defrauding and 'achieving' even by hurting and killing may become quite easy affairs. Soon crime might become no shame but a pride for such a person. Associations with other criminals may develop in him such feelings of loyalty, obligation and affiliation that it may eventually become difficult to dissociate himself from the world of crime (see, for example, Hanson et al. 1984; Panella, Cooper & Henggeler, 1982).

A very conducive situation of being exposed to socially undesirable persons and learn the criminal modes of behaviour is available to a first offender in a prison. As commonly observed and believed, the jail in our country is the first academy where the actual training in the art of crime is obtained. The first offender, having lost his prestige, honour, money and a socially desirable career, if at all he had one, becomes very vulnerable to the dreadfully criminal atmosphere of the prison. The company of other criminals does nothing except developing friendships and getting encouragement to indulge into criminal activities again after release. These factors, in fact, also explain the phenomenon of relapse into crime. Inappropriate

adjustments after release from prison may not let an individual settle into some lawful activity. His family or his relatives may have lost respect for him, or many adverse social or economic changes may have taken place which might make his social adjustment more difficult. He is usually not accepted by the law-abiding group. The slur on his name as being an ex-convict usually remains with him permanently. As mentioned earlier, his own family, and "bradari" (larger family) may not accept him and many other psycho-socio-economic changes which might have happened in his absence from his home, may make his socio-economic adjustment in a law-abiding group extremely difficult. Eventually he may resort to criminal way of life where not only is his sense of worthiness is likely to be enhanced, but also his living is secured.

A Non-professional Criminal

The role of adverse social-psychological factors in giving an individual a proneness to criminal behaviour seems to be quite convincing when examined in the context of specific forms of criminality. However, to establish the causal relationship with all types of criminals would be unrealistic. The influence of family patterns, conditions, and modes of discipline on delinquent conduct and criminal behaviour may be difficult to ignore, but to argue that family variables always have primacy over all others would be to draw a caricature of real life. Then, claims that some particular family pattern is found in all forms of criminality are equally erroneous. Schafer (1976) comments: "The role of the family in crime thus tends to lean in a favourable direction when examined through speculation and logic; but even happy home relationships, crime free parents and the best possible socialization processes for firm resistance against criminality may not overcome the negative characteristics of outside crime-pulls and crime pressures".

Obviously, all criminals are not recidivists. Thousands commit crimes only once in their lives, and never repeat it. These are the offenders, most of whom, if not all, could be called situational, accidental, occasional or Non-professional criminals.

Accidental offenders are the persons who are involved in criminal acts by chance or mistake. Not very infrequently, such news items appear in the papers that so and so, a friend, a wife, a son, etc., was killed when somebody was cleaning his gun which fired accidentally. Careless driving or thoughtless throwing away of burning match may put an otherwise law-abiding man in a serious predicament. Many a traffic violations, and various types of accidents come under this type of offense and their committer are to form the group of our Non-professional criminals.

There are various situations in which a person may behave in a spontaneous manner and his behaviour happens to be against the dictates of law. Their criminal act is only a sad predicament which they faced because of the situational factors.

Violence, particularly the non-political one, results from interpersonal conflicts and disputes under some provocative situations. The life in villages of Pakistan is full of situations and cultural practices which may be considered crimogenic. Earlier research (see, for example, Kanwar, 1989; Tariq and Durrani, 1983) suggests that, in rural areas, disputes and conflicts arise among people because of the agricultural and allied activities. These disputes frequently lead to brawls and scuffles which result in hurts and murders. As mentioned earlier also, once a person of a family is hurt, killed or insulted, the retaliative actions by the other family are sure to take place. People are dissatisfied with fairness of the justice dispensed in the country and hence may take law in their own hands. The value of taking revenge personally is esteemed high and this results in assaults and killings even by those persons who have otherwise non-criminal patterns of behaviour.

Much homicide particularly in Pakistani villages can be attributed to 'woman' also. Husband frequently kill their wives and their paramours because of the illicit relations with each other (Kanwar, 1989; Tariq and Durrani, 1983). Sometimes fathers and brothers kill their daughters and sisters to save the honour of the family and wash off the slur on its name. Tariq and Durrani (1983) observe:

Hardly any kidnapping or instance of rape is not followed by hurts and murders of the indulgers. Again, at a deeper level of analysis, are discovered the pressures of social values prevalent in the society, illiteracy, lack of awareness of legal prosecutions, and complete dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of law-enforcing agencies (p. 54).

Non-professional's criminal acts seem to be the outcome of a socialization process in a society where certain social values like personal vengeance to save one's honour and that of the family are exalted to such an extent that these may become quite potent determinants of behaviour. Hence the committers of violent offenses may be free from the alleged baleful impact of any psychologically adverse circumstances and yet may commit heinous crimes such as murder and assault. Their crimes may be explained as an outcome of certain provocative situational factors or/and social and cultural practices, public institutions' inefficiency and defective legal systems in the country.

A psychological analysis of the social values which force or drive individuals to violent acts of crime may lead us to conclude that violent behaviour is at times the result of personality make-up. Elements in personality especially significant for the explanation of crime include interests, opinions, habits, and attitudes. The type of personality a child will have is largely determined by the nature of general culture and by the nature of interpersonal relations in the particular family into which he is born. The family is the medium through which the larger culture impinges upon him

in early childhood. In the family also the temperament of the child is influenced by the temperament of parents. Taft and England (1964) observe that even traits called psychogenetic, such as egocentricity, reflect in part the general culture as mediated by the family. They contend that personality affects behaviour, but in doing so, it is the medium through which present and past social situations operate.

Thus, viewing from a social-psychological angle, crime committed under the pressure of a value system may not be socially deviant behaviour. On the contrary, it is a behaviour which is exactly in accord with the society and demands of its values. A child, since childhood, incorporates these values in his mind and these become an integral part of his personality dynamics. Moreover, when he acts in the way society wants him to act, his behaviour is reinforced by the appreciation he, directly or indirectly, receives from his family, "bradri" (larger family or tribe) and society at large. The individual doing some revengeful heroic deed, is not only appreciated but honoured also. At least he is saved from insult, dishonour, and shame. Seeking help of law is sometimes considered a sign of cowardice and may bring dishonour to the family one of whose members is murdered, kidnapped, raped, beaten or just insulted. Generations may pass and even the court may have penalized the offender, but it remains a slur on family's name if the offender or his family is not paid back in the same coins. One who succeeds becomes the hero, one who fails is condemned and humiliated.

This behaviour gets further reinforced through mass media and literature. Our folk tales and films do not slack in depicting the same phenomenon quite frequently. Honour, prestige, and ego are shown to be supreme, and even law can be defied to maintain their supremacy. Criminals are sometimes highly glorified in films and magazines, their heinous crimes are presented as heroic deeds in thrilling literature and law is usually belittled and sometimes befooled in many Punjabi films.

All these cultural influences are convincing enough to explain the criminality of the Non-professional criminals most of whom are otherwise law-abiding citizens. Stigma of family problems, pressure of social values and ineffective public institutions and law-enforcing agencies weave the web of criminality around them without their being criminals by temperament, habit, or profession.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of the study have research as well as practical implications. It seems that for a better understanding of the etiological processes of criminal behaviour, attention should be directed toward specific types of criminals and not only toward the crime or delinquency in general. As crime and delinquency represent heterogeneous forms of behaviour, different types of crimes as denoted by legal articles do not indicate theoretically significant types. Instead, an empirically derived classification scheme which describes and classifies specific forms of criminals, like Professionals and Non-professionals, "one-time losers" and hardened recidivists, is likely to be more meaningful in terms of both causal explanations and adequate handling and treatment of offenders.

On the basis of the findings of this study it may be suggested that Professional criminals and Non-professional criminals should be treated differentially. The latter type deserves special considerations in the legal procedures and punitive and rehabilitative measures. Firstly, a penal system may distinguish between Professional criminals at one hand, and the Non-professionals who usually commit crime only once in their lives, on the other. Former may need severe punishment and repressive measures but the latter deserve a more constructive outlook aimed at social protection and rehabilitation.

Inside the prison, there seems to be a need for segregating Professional criminals from those who are Non-professional ones. The Professional criminals may require different treatment and security measures. Any rehabilitative and reformatory steps, if taken, are likely to produce less effective and fruitful results on them. Therefore, they may be kept in maximum security prisons and handled with stringent measures. But the Non-professional criminals should be kept in prisons situated in their home towns so that they could have an easy contact with their relatives and family. This segregation is also desirable as through this, Non-professional criminals could be protected from those harmful effects which the Professionals are most likely to cast on them if both types are kept indiscriminately together. As regards the labour taken from prisoners, the Non-professionals should be paid reasonable wages. In fact, the Non-professional types of criminals may be put to work in some factories, industrial homes, and similar work situations specially organized and established for such criminals. In these set-ups, the prisoners may not only contribute productively they might as well get education and training for new trades. This would assist in rehabilitative efforts of such convicts because if they receive reasonable wages in return of their labour, they may adopt a favourable attitude towards law, support their families outside and even accumulate savings to assist them in the difficult task of adjustment after release.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamsen, D. (1960). *The psychology of crime*. New York: The Columbia University Press.
- Ahmed, I. (1986). *Development of Urdu Version of California Psychological Inventory (CPI) in Pakistan*. Unpublished Draft Report. Islamabad: National Institute of Psychology.
- Aichhorn, A. (1955). *Wayward youth*. New York: Meridian Books.
- Akers, R. L. (1985). *Deviant behaviour: A social learning approach* (3rd ed.). New York: Wads-Worth.
- Alexander, J. F. (1973). Defensive and supportive communications in normal and deviant families. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 40, 223-231.
- Altaf, W. (1988). *A profile of delinquents and non-delinquents on the CPI*. M. Phil Unpublished Thesis. Islamabad: National Institute of Psychology.
- Andry, R. G. (1960). *Delinquency and parental pathology*. London: Methuen.
- Ansari, Z. A., Farooqi, G. N., Yasmin, M., Khan, S., & Farooqi, S. (1982). *Development of an Urdu Adjective Checklist: A preliminary report*. Unpublished Draft Report. Islamabad: National Institute of Psychology.
- Ashfaq, S. (1987). *Differences in personality variables and levels of anxiety in female patients with conversion reaction and female patients with other neuroses*. Unpublished M. Phil Thesis. Islamabad: National Institute of Psychology.
- Astin, A. W. (1959). A factor study of the MMPI psychopathic deviate scale. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 23, 550-554.
- Atwood, R., Gold, M., & Taylor, R. (1989). Two types of delinquents and their institutional adjustment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57(11), 68-75.

- Auolakh, C. A. M. A. (1986). *Criminal justice, crime, punishment and treatment in Islamic Republic of Pakistan*. Lahore: Pak Muslim Academy.
- Austin, J. (1983). Assessing the new generation of prison classification models. *Crime and Delinquency*, 29, 561-576.
- Azcarate, E., & Gutierrez, M. (1969). Differentiation of institutional adjustment of juvenile delinquents with the Hand Test. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 25, 200-202.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bartol, C. R., & Bartol, A. M. (1986). *Criminal behaviour: A psychological approach*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Bell, R. Q. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. *Psychological Review*, 75, 81-95.
- Berger, R. J., Crowley, J. E., Gold, M., & Gray, J. (1975). *Experiment in a juvenile court: A study of a program of volunteers working with juvenile probationers*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research*.
- Berkowitz, L. (1983). The experience of anger as a parallel process in the display of impulsive "angry" aggression. In R. G. Green & E. I. Donnerstein, (Eds.) *Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews* (Vol. 1). New York: Academic Press.
- Bloch, H. A., & Gels, G. (1962). *Man, crime, and society*. New York: Random House.
- Branden, N. (1990). What is self-esteem. Paper presented at the first international conference on *self-esteem* (August, 9, 1990 Asker/Oslo, Norway).
- Bricklin, B., Piotrowski, Z. A., & Wagner, E. E. (1962). The Hand Test: With special reference to the prediction of overt aggressive behavior. In M. Harrower (Ed.), *American lecture series in psychology*. Springfield, IL.: Charles C. Thomas*.
- Brodsky, S. L., & Brodsky, A. M. (1967). Hand Test indicators of anti-social behavior. *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment*, 31, 36-39.

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1961). Toward a theoretical model of the analysis of parent-child relationships in a social context. In J. Glidewell (Ed.) *Parent attitudes and child behaviour*. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas.
- Bruner, J. S. (1980). *Beyond the information given*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Buikhuisen, W., & Meijls, B. W. G. P. (1983). A psychosocial approach to recidivism: An application of latent variable causal modeling technique. In K. T. Van Dusen & S. A. Mednick (Eds.). *Prospective studies of crime and delinquency*, Boston, MA: Kluwer-Nighoff Publishing.
- Burl, C. (1944). *The young delinquent* (4th ed.). New York: Appelton*.
- Caldwell, R. G. (1965). *Criminology*, New York: Ronald.
- Campos, L. P. (1968). Other projective techniques. In A. I. Robin (Ed.). *Projective techniques in personality assessment: A modern introduction*. New York. Springer.
- Cavan, R.S. (1962). *Criminology*, New York: Crowell.
- Chaiken, J. M. and Chaiken, M. R. (1982). *Varieties of criminal behaviour*. Santa Monica, CA.: Rand Corporation.
- Choudhry, S., & Malhotra, P. (1988). A study of criminals in relation to anxiety, self-esteem, and locus of control. *Journal of Personality and Clinical Studies*, 4(1), 75-79.
- Cleckly, H. (1976). *The mask of sanity* (5th ed.). St. Louis: Mosby*.
- Clinard, M.B. (1968). *Sociology of Deviant Behavior*, (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Clinard, M. B., & Quinney, R. (1973). *Criminal behaviour systems*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Cohen, A. K., & Short, J. F. Jr. (1958). Research on delinquent subcultures. *Journal of Social Issues*, 3, 20-37.

- Conger, J. J. & Miller, W. C. (1966). *Personality, Social class, and delinquency*. New York: John Wiley.
- Corcini, R. J. (1949). Criminal typology. In V. C. Branham and S. B. Kutash (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Criminology*. New York: Philosophical Library*.
- Cortes, J. B., & Gatti, F. M. (1972). *Delinquency and crime: A bio-psycho-social approach*. New York: Seminar Press Inc.
- Datel, W. E. (1962). Socialization scale norms on military samples. *Military Medicine*, 27, 740-744.
- Davidson, W. S. II., Render, R., Blakely, C. H., Mitchell, C. M., & Emshoff, J. G. (1987). Diversion of juvenile offenders: an experimental comparison. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 68-75.
- Deleon, G., Skodal, A., & Rosenthal, M. S. (1973). Changes in psychological signs of resident drug addicts. *Arch General Psychiatry*, 28, 131-135*.
- Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (1980). (3rd ed). Washington, DC. :American Psychiatric Association.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L. W., Miller, N. E. Mower, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Driver, E. D. (1968). A critique of typologies in criminology. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 38 (Fall), 356-373.
- Dunford, F. W., & Elliott, D. S. (1984). Identifying career offenders using self-report data. *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency*, 21, 57-86.
- Ellis, L. (1984). Genetics and criminal behaviour: Evidence through the end of 1970s. *Criminology*, 20, 43-66.
- Empey, L. T., & Erickson, M. L. (1972). *The Provo experiment*. Lexington, MD: Lexington Books*.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1973). *The inequality of man*. San Diego, CA: Edits Publishers*.

- Eysenck, H. J. (1977). *Crime and personality*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Eysenck, S. B. G., & Eysenck, H. J. (1970). Crime and personality: An empirical study of the three-factor theory. *British Journal of Criminology*, 10, 225-239.
- Faunce, E. E., & Riskin, J. (1970). Family interaction scales II. Data analysis and findings. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 22, 513-526.
- Ferreira, A. J., & Winter, W. D. (1968). Information exchange and silence in normal and abnormal families. *Family Process*, 7, 251-276.
- Fisher, S. (1962). The MMPI: Assessing a famous personality test. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 6, 21-22*.
- Fox, R. G. (1971). The xyy offender: A modern myth? *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 62, 59-73.
- Friedberg, R. D. (1982). Locus of control and self-concept in a status offender population. *Psychological Reports*, 50(1), 289-290.
- Friedlander, K. (1971). *The psychoanalytic approach to Juvenile delinquency*. London: Routledge & Kegan-Paul.
- Garabedian, P. G. (1964). Social roles in a correctional community. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 55(September), 338-347.
- Giallombardo, R. (1966). *Society of women: A study of a women's prison*. New York: Wiley*.
- Gibbons, D. C. (1965). *Changing the law breaker*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Gibbons, D. C. (1968). *Society, crime and criminal career*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Gibbons, D. C. (1979). *The criminological enterprise*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Gibbons, D. C. (1981). *Delinquent behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.

- Gibbons, D. C. (1985). The assumption of the efficacy of middle-range explanation: Typologies. In R. F. Meler (Ed.), *Theoretical methods in criminology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gibbons, D. C. (1987). *Society, crime and criminal behaviour*, (5th edition), Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Gibbons, D. C. (1988). Some critical observations on criminal types and criminal careers. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 15(1), 8-23.
- Gibbons, D. C., & Jones, J. F. (1975). *The study of deviance*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Gibbons, D. C., & Krohn, M. D. (1986). *Delinquent behaviour* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gibbs, J. P. (1960). "Needed": Analytical typologies in criminology. *South-Western Social Science Quarterly*, 40(March), 321-329*.
- Gillin, J. L. (1946). *The Wisconsin prisoner: Studies in criminogenesis*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press*.
- Glaser, D. (1972). *Adult crime and social policy*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Glaser, D. (1975). *Strategic criminal justice planning*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.
- Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1934). *1,000 Juvenile delinquents*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University*.
- Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1951). *Unravelling juvenile delinquency*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1956). *Physique and delinquency*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goddard, H. H. (1914). *Feeble-mindedness: Its causes and consequences*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gold, M., & Mann, D. W. (1984). *Expelled to a friendlier place*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Gold, M., & Petronio, R. J. (1980). Delinquent behaviour in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.) *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 495-535). New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Goppinger, H. (1987). *Life style and criminality*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Gottfredson, D. M., & Tonry, M. (Eds.)(1987). *Prediction and classification: Criminal justice decision making*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gough, H. G. (1948). A sociological theory of psychopathy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 53, 359-366.
- Gough, H. G. (1960). Theory and measurement of Socialization. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 23-30.
- Gough, H. G. (1965). Conceptual analysis of psychological test scores and other diagnostic variables. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 70, 294-320.
- Gough, H. G., & Peterson, D. R. (1952). The identification and measurement of predispositional factors in crime and delinquency. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 16, 207-212.
- Gove, R. W., & Crutchfield, R. D. (1982). The family and juvenile delinquency. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23, 301-319.
- Greenberg, D. F. (1985). Age, crime, and social explanations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91, 1-21.
- Gudjonsson, G. H. (1984). Attribution of blame for criminal acts and its relationship with personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 5, 53-58.
- Guttmacher, M. S. (1960). *The mind of the murderer*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Haddox, W., & Jacobson, M. (1972). Psychological adjustment, mood and personality functions of long term methadone maintenance patients. *International Journal of Addiction*, 7, 619-627*.

- Hakeem, M. (1958). A critique of the psychiatric approach. In J. S. Roucek (ed.), *Juvenile delinquency*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Halverson, C. F. Jr. (1988). Remembering your parents: Reflections on the retrospective method. *Journal of Personality*, 56, 435-443.
- Hanson, C. L., Henggeler, S. W., Haefele, W. F., & Rodick, J. D. (1984). Demographic, individual, and family relationship correlates of serious and repeated crime among adolescents and their siblings. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 52(4), 528-538.
- Haramis, S. L., & Wagner, E. E. (1980). Differentiation between acting-out and non-acting-out alcoholics with the Rorschach and Hand Test. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 36, 791-797.
- Hartjen, C. A. , & Gibbons, D. C. (1969). An empirical investigation of a criminal typology. *Sociology and Social Research*, 54, 56-62.
- Hassan, I. N. (1982). *Psychological profile of rural women*. Unpublished Draft Report. Islamabad: National Institute of Psychology.
- Hathaway, S., & Monachesi, E. D. (Eds.) (1953). *Analyzing and predicting juvenile delinquency with Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hathaway, S., & Monachesi, E. D. (1963). *Adolescent personality and behaviour—MMPI patterns*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hayner, N. S. (1961). Characteristics of five offender types. *American Sociological Review*, 26 (February), 96-102.
- Healy, W. (1915). *The individual delinquent*. London: Little Brown.
- Healy, W., & Bronner, A. F. (1926). *Delinquency and criminals: their making and unmaking*. New York: Macmillan.
- Heffernan E. (1972). *Making it in prison*. New York: John Wiley.

- Henggeler, S. W. (Ed.). (1982). *Delinquency and adolescent psychopathology: A family-ecological systems approach*. Littleton, MA: Wright-PSG*.
- Hetherington, E. M., Stouwie, R. J., & Ridberg, E. H. (1971). Patterns of family interaction and child-rearing attitudes related to three dimensions of juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 78*, 160-176.
- Hewitt, L. E., & Jenkins, R. A. (1946). *Fundamental patterns of maladjustment*. Springfield: State of Illinois.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, T., & Hindelang, M. J. (1977). Intelligence and delinquency: A revisionist review. *American Sociological Review, 42*, 571-87.
- Hollin, C. R., & Howells, K. (1987). Lay explanations of delinquency: global or offence-specific? *British Journal of Social Psychology, 26*, 203-210.
- Hutchings, B., & Mednick, S. A. (1977). Criminality in adoptees and their adoptive and biological parents: A pilot study. In S. A. Mednick & K. A. Christiansen (Eds.), *Biological bases of criminal behaviour*. New York: Gardner Press.
- Jesness, C. F., & Wedge, R. F. (1984). Validity of revised Jesness Inventory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52*(6), 997-1010.
- Kanwar, M. (1989). *Murder and homicide in Pakistan*. Lahore: Vanguard.
- Kilman, P. (1974). Personality characteristics of female narcotic addicts. *Psychological Reports, 35*, 485-486.
- Klein, M. W. (1971). *Street groups and street workers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Klein, M. W. (1984). Offense specialization and versatility among juveniles. *British Journal of Criminology, 24*, 185-194.
- Korin, H. (1974). Comparisons of psychometric measures in psychiatric patients using heroin and other drugs. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 83*(2), 208-212.

- Lab, S. P. (1984). Patterns of juvenile misbehaviour. *Criminology*, 30, 293-308.
- Lang, R. A. Holden, R. , Langevin, R. Pugh, G. M., & Wu, R. (1987). Personality and criminality in violent offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2(2), 179-195*.
- Leger, R. G. (1979). Research findings and theory as a function of operationalization of variables: A comparison of four identification techniques for the construct, "inmate type". *Sociology and Social Research*, 63, 346-374*.
- Lemert, E. M. (1953). An isolation and closure theory of naive check forgery. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 44(September-October), 296-307.
- Lemert, E. M. (1958). The behavior of the systematic check forger. *Social Problems*, 6(Fall), 141-149.
- Lillyquist, M. J. (1980). *Understanding and changing criminal behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Lindesmith, A. R., & Dunham, W. H. (1956). Some principles of criminal typology. In J. E. Nordskog, E. C. McDonap, & M. J. Vincet (Eds.). *Analyzing social problems (rev. ed.)*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc.
- Loeber, R. (1982). The stability of antisocial and delinquent child behaviour: A review. *Child development*, 53, 1431-1446.
- Loeber, R., & Dishion, T. (1983). Early predictors of male delinquency. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 68-99.
- Low, D. A. (1982). *Thieves Kitchen*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons*.
- Mannheim, H., & Wilkins, L. T. (1955). *Prediction methods in relation to borstal training*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Manganiello, J. (1978). Opiate addiction: A study of identifying three systematically related psychological correlates. *International Journal of Addiction*, 13, 839-847*.

- McCord, J. A. (1979). Some child-rearing antecedents of criminal behaviour in adult men. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 1477-1486.
- McCord, W. & McCord, J. (1956). *Psychopathy and delinquency*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. J., Jr. (1988). Recalled parent-child relations and adult personality. *Journal of Personality*, 56, 417-434.
- McFarland, E. S. (1979). Responses to the Hand Test given by college and incarcerated males. (Doctoral Dissertation. University of Oklohama, 1979) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1980, 40, 4529A. (University Microfilms No. 80-04, 392).
- McGiboney, G. W., & Huey, W. C. (1982). Hand test norms for disruptive black adolescent males. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 54, 441-442*.
- McKenna, J. J. (1972). An empirical testing of a typology of adult criminal behaviour. *Ph. D. dissertation*. University of Notre Dame.
- McKinney, J. C. (1966). *Constructive Typology and Social Theory*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Mednick, S. A. (1980). Primary prevention of juvenile delinquency. In D. Shichor & H. Kelly (eds.). *Critical Issues in Juvenile delinquency*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.
- Megargee, E. I. (1964). Undercontrol and overcontrol in assaultive and homicidal adolescents. *Doctoral Dissertation*. University of California, Berkley. Ann Arbor, Mick.: University Microfilms*.
- Megargee, E. I. (1966d). Undercontrolled and overcontrolled personality types in extreme antisocial aggression. *Psychological Monographs*, 80(3, whole No. 611)*.
- Megargee, E. I., Bohn, M. J., Jr., Meyer, J. E., Jr., & Sink, F. (1979). *Classifying criminal offenders*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Menard, S., & Morse, B. J. (1984). A structuralist critique of the IQ-delinquency hypothesis: Theory and evidence. *American Journal of Sociology*, 89, 1347-78.

- Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning conceptualization of personality. *Psychological Review*, 80, 252-283.
- Monahan, J. (1981). *The clinical prediction of violent behaviour*. Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Mental Health*.
- Morris, A. (1965). The comprehensive classification of adult offenders. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 56(June), 197-202.
- Murray, H. A. (1965). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Science Edition, Inc*.
- Neustatter, W. L. (1957). *The mind of the murder*. New York: Philosophical Library*.
- O'Mahony, P., & Smith, E. (1984). Some personality characteristics of imprisoned heroin addicts. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 13, 255-256*.
- Oswald, O., & Loftus, P. T. (1967). A normative and comparative study of the Hand Test with normal and delinquent children. *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment*, 31, 62-68.
- Panella, D. H., Cooper, P. F., & Henggeler, S. W. (1982). Peer relations in adolescence. In S. W. Henggeler (Ed.), *Delinquency and adolescent psychopathology: A family-ecological systems approach* (pp. 139-161). Littleton, MA: Wright-PSG.
- Petersilia, J., Greenwood, P. W., and Lavin, M. (1977). *Criminal careers of habitual felons*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Peterson, M. A. Braiker, H. B. and Polich, S. M. (1980). *Doing Crime*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Peterson, Pittman, & O'Neal (1962). Stabilities in deviance: A study of assaultive and non-assaultive offenders. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 53, 44-48.
- Peterson, D. R., Quay, H. C., & Anderson, A. C. (1959). Extending the construct validity of a socialization scale. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 23, 182.

- Platt, J. J. (1975). Addiction proneness and personality in heroin addicts. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 84*, 303-304.
- Pollock, V., Mednick, S. A., & Gabrielli, W. F. Jr. (1983). Crime causation: biological theories. In S. H. Kadish (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Crime and Criminal Justice*. Vol. 1. New York: Free Press.
- Poole, E. D., Regoli, R. M., and Thomas, C. W. (1980). The measurement of inmate social role types: An assessment. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 71*, 317-324.
- Porecki, D., & Vandergoot, D. (1978). The Hand Test Acting Out Score as a predictor of acting out in correctional settings. *Offender Rehabilitation, 2*(3), 269-273*.
- Quay, H. (ed.)(1987). *Handbook of Juvenile delinquency*. New York: Wiley.
- Quay, H. C., & Parsons, C. B. (1972). *The differential behavioural classification of the juvenile offender* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: U. S. Bureau of Prisons.
- Qureshi, A. H., & Akbar, H. (1979). A study of self-esteem, anxiety and neuroticism. In M. B. Buch (Ed.), *Second survey of research in education*, Baroda: Society for Educational Research and Development.
- Reckless, W. C. (1961). *The crime problems*. New York: Appelton-Century-Croft, Inc.
- Reckless, W. C. (1967). *The crime problem*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S., & Kay, B. (1957). The self concept in potential delinquency and potential non-delinquency. *American Sociological Review, 22*, 566-570.
- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S., & Murray, E. (1957). The 'good' boy in a high delinquency area. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 48*, 18-25.
- Reid, W. H. (1985). The antisocial personality: A review. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry, Vol. 36**.
- Riskin, J., & Faunce, E. E. (1970b). Family interaction scales III. Discussion of methodology and substantive findings. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 22*, 527-537.

- Robins, L. N. (1966). *Deviant children grown up*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
- Rockwell, D. A. (1978). Social and familial correlates of antisocial disorders. In W. H. Reid (Ed.) *The Psychopath: A comprehensive study of antisocial disorders and behaviours*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Roebuck, J. B. (1967). *Criminal typology*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- Rutter, M., & Giller, H. (1984). *Juvenile delinquency: Trends and perspectives*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Sarbin, T. R., & Miller, J. E. (1970). Demonism revisited: The xyy chromosomal abnormality. *Issues in Criminology*, 5, 195-107*.
- Scarr, H. A., Pinsky, J. L. and Wyatt, D. S. (1973). *Patterns of burglary*. Washington, D. C. : Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.
- Schafer, S. (1969). *Theories in criminology*. New York: Random House.
- Schafer, S. (1976). *Introduction to criminology*. Reston, Virginia: Prentice-Hall.
- Schneider, D. J., Hastorf, A. H., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1979). *Person perception*. London: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Schrag, C. C. (1954). Analysing and predicting delinquency with Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. *American Sociological Review*, 19, 490-91.
- Schrag, C. C. (1961a). Some foundations for a theory of correction. In D. R. Cressey (ed.), *The prison: studies in institutional organization and change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Schrag, C.C. (1961b). A preliminary criminal typology. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 4, 11-16*.
- Sellin, T. (1958). Recidivism and maturation. *National Probation and Parole Association Journal*, 4, 241-250.

- Shafiq, M. (1987). *The self-concept of heroin addicts as compared to non-addicts*. Unpublished M. Phil. Thesis. Islamabad. National Institute of Psychology.
- Shah, S. A., & Roth, L. H. (1974). Biological and psychophysiological factors in criminality. In D. Glaser (Ed.) *Handbook of Criminology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Shahi & Thaukur (1977). Relationship between manifest anxiety and self-esteem. In M. B. Buch (Ed.). *Second Survey of Research in Education*, Baroda: Society for Educational Research and Development.
- Shantz, C. H. (1975). *The development of social cognition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sheppard, C., Ricca, E., Fracchia, J., & Merlis, S. (1974). Psychological needs of suburban male heroin addicts. *The Journal of Psychology*, 87, 123-128.
- Shoham, S. (1964). Conflict situations and delinquent solutions. *Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 64, 85-215.
- Sinha, D., & Singh, U. P. (1968). The self concept of criminals. *Psychological Studies*, 13(2), 118-123.
- Smigel, E. O. (1970). Public attitudes towards stealing as related to the size of victim organization. In E. O. Smigel & H. L. Ross (eds.). *Crimes against bureaucracy*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold*.
- Sobhyavathi & Thomas (1984). Locus of control and self-esteem in a neurotic sample. *Journal of Personality*, 52(2), 70-78.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1955). *Principles of criminology* (5th ed.). New York: Lippincot Co*.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1978). *Criminology* (10th edition). Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Sulker, P. B., Archer, R. P., & Allain, A. N. (1978). Drug abuse pattern, personality characteristics and relationship with sex. *Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 1374-1378.

- Sykes, G. M. (1958). *The society of captives*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press*.
- Taft, D. R., & England, R. W. (1964). *Criminology*. (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Tennenbaum, D. J. (1977). Research studies of personality and criminality: A summary and implications of the literature. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 5, 1-19*.
- Tappan, P. W. (1960). *Crime, Justice, and Correction*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tariq, P. N. (1981). *A study of female crime in rural and urban areas of Pakistan*. Islamabad: Women's Division, Cabinet Secretariat, Government of Pakistan. Reprinted in 1987 by National Institute of Psychology, Islamabad.
- Tariq, P. N., & Durrani, N. (1983). Socio-psychological aspects of crime in Pakistan. *Psychological Research Monograph No. 1*. Islamabad: National Institute of Psychology.
- Thompson, G. N. (1962). *The psychopathic delinquent and criminal*. Springfield, Illinois:
- Tobias, J. J. (1967). *Crime and industrial society in the 19th century*. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd.
- Toch, H. (1969). *Violent men: An inquiry into the psychology of violence*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Vold, G. B., Bernard, T. J. (1986). *Theoretical criminology*. (3rd ed) New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wagner, E. E. (1983). *The Hand Test: Manual*. (Revised, 1983). Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Wagner, E. E., & Hawkins, R. (1964). Differentiation of assaultive delinquents with the Hand Test. *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment*, 28, 363-365.

- Wagner, E. E., & Romanik, D. G. (1976). Hand Test characteristics of marijuana-experienced and multiple-drug-using college students. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 43, 1303-1306*.
- Waldo, G. P., & Dinitz, S. (1967). Personality attributes of the criminal: An analysis of research studies, 1950-1965. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 4, 185-202.
- Warren, M. Q. (1976). Intervention with juvenile delinquents. In M. K. Rosenheim (Ed.), *Pursuing justice for the child*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- West, D. J. (1988). Psychological contributions to criminology. *British Journal of Criminology*, 28(2), 77-91.
- West, D. J., & Farrington, D.P. (1973). *Who becomes delinquent?* London: Heinemann.
- West, D. J., & Farrington, D.P. (1977). *The delinquent way of life*. London: Heinemann.
- Wetsel, H., Shapiro, R. J., & Wagner, E. E. (1967). Prediction of recidivism among juvenile delinquents with the Hand Test. *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment*, 31, 69-72.
- Wilcock, K. D. (1964). Neurotic differences between individualized and socialized criminals. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 28, 141-145.
- Wilson, H. (1980). Parental supervision: A neglected aspect of delinquency. *British Journal of Criminology*, 20, 203-235.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Herrnstein, R. J. (1985). *Crime and human nature*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wolfgang, M. E. (1958). *Patterns of criminal homicide*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R. M., & Sellin, T. (1972). *Delinquency in a birth cohort*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zimbardo, P. G. (1969). The human choice: Individuation, reason, and order versus deindividuation, impulse, and chaos. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, 17, 237-307.

* *These are quoted from secondary sources.*

آپ کا نام _____
 تجربہ (سالوں میں) _____

پیشہ _____
 پتہ _____

تعلیم _____

جرائم پیشہ افراد کی خصوصیات
 کا سیمینوارٹیکل مضمون

یہ سوالنامہ جرائم پیشہ (Professional Criminals) اور عام مجرموں میں
 فرق واضح کرنے کے لئے ترتیب دیا گیا ہے۔ آپ جرائم پیشہ لوگوں کی خصوصیات کو
 مدنظر رکھ کر اس سوالنامے کا جواب دیں اور اپنے بہترین تسمان سے مشکور فرمائیں۔۔۔
 صحیح جواب کے لئے " ہاں " یا " نہیں " پر (✓) کا نشان لگائیں۔

- (۱) جرائم پیشہ لوگوں کی روزی کا دارومدار ہی جرائم پر ہوتا ہے۔ ہاں
 (۲) جرائم پیشہ لوگ مافی من بھی کئی جرائم میں ملوث ہوتے ہیں۔ ہاں
 (۳) جرائم پیشہ لوگ زیادہ تر قتل اور اقدام قتل (زخمی کرنا) جیسے
 جرائم کرتے ہیں۔ ہاں

- (۴) جرائم پیشہ لوگ عموماً ایک ہی بار مجرم کرتے ہیں۔ ہاں
 (۵) جرائم پیشہ لوگوں کا بنیادی مقصد دوسروں کے مال پر آسٹھہ
 کرنا ہوتا ہے، اس لئے عموماً وہ حسب ترائی، چوری اور ڈاکہ زنی
 جیسے جرائم کرتے ہیں۔ ہاں
 (۶) جرائم پیشہ لوگوں کے دوست اور ساتھی عموماً جرائم ہمیشہ ہوتے ہیں۔ ہاں
 (۷) جرائم پیشہ لوگ عموماً پلاننگ یعنی منصوبے کے تحت مجرم کرتے ہیں۔ ہاں
 (۸) جرائم پیشہ لوگ قتل اور اقدام قتل جیسے جرائم کا ارتکاب اس وقت
 کرتے ہیں جب ان کے اہل منصوبے میں کوئی رکاوٹ ڈالنے اور ان کو
 مگڑنے جانے کا خوف نہ ہو۔ ہاں

- (۹) جرائم پیشہ لوگوں کا نشانہ عموماً ان کے عزیز و اقارب ہوتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں
- (۱۰) جرائم پیشہ لوگوں کا نشانہ عموماً ایسے لوگ ہوتے ہیں جن سے ان کی ذاتی واقفیت ہوتی ہے - ہاں نہیں
- (۱۱) جرائم پیشہ لوگوں کا نشانہ عموماً ایسے لوگ ہوتے ہیں جو اسی گاؤں یا محلے میں رہتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں

بعض لوگ ذاتی دشمنی ، ہوانی اور خاندانی دشمنی یا کسی سے عزتی کا بدلہ لینے کے لئے جرم کرتے ہیں - ایسے لوگوں کے بارے میں مندرجہ ذیل سوالوں کے جواب دیں -

- (۱۲) ایسے لوگ جرائم پیشہ کہلائیں گے - ہاں نہیں
- (۱۳) ایسے لوگ عموماً قتل یا اقدام قتل جیسے جرائم کرتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں
- (۱۴) ایسے لوگ عموماً ایک ہی بار جرم کرتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں
- (۱۵) ایسے لوگ عموماً بلاننگ یعنی منموہے کے تحت جرم کرتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں
- (۱۶) ایسے لوگ عموماً چوری ، ڈاکہ اور نقب زنی جیسے جرائم کرتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں
- (۱۷) ایسے لوگوں کے ساتھی اور دوست جرائم پیشہ ہوتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں

بعض لوگ آپس کے تعلقات میں اختلافات ، لڑائی جھگڑے ، زمین کے تنازعے ، رشتوں ، شادی بیاہ ، عورت کے معاملات اور رویے پیسے کے لین دین کی وجوہات کی بناء پر جرم کرتے ہیں - ان لوگوں کے بارے میں مندرجہ ذیل سوالوں کے جواب دیں :

- (۱۸) ایسے لوگ جرائم پیشہ کہلائیں گے - ہاں نہیں
- (۱۹) ایسے لوگ عموماً قتل یا اقدام قتل جیسے جرائم کرتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں
- (۲۰) ایسے لوگ عموماً ایک ہی بار جرم کرتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں
- (۲۱) ایسے لوگ عموماً بلاننگ یعنی منموہے کے تحت جرم کرتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں
- (۲۲) ایسے لوگ عموماً چوری ، ڈاکہ اور نقب زنی جیسے جرائم کرتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں
- (۲۳) ایسے لوگوں کے ساتھی اور دوست جرائم پیشہ ہوتے ہیں - ہاں نہیں

INTERVIEW GUIDE

سوالنامہ برائے قیدی

انٹرویور _____ جیل _____ ایڈمشن نمبر _____

معلوماتی شیٹ

(۱) نام: _____ والد کا نام: _____ تاریخ پیدائش و عمر: _____

(۲) آپ کہاں کے رہنے والے ہیں؟ پتہ وغیرہ؟: _____

ہدایات :

میں یونیورسٹی میں پڑھاتا ہوں۔ ہم معاشرے کے مختلف مسئلوں کے بارے میں جاننے کی کوشش کرتے رہتے ہیں، تاکہ ان کو سمجھا جائے اور پھر ان کا کوئی حل بھی نکالا جائے۔ آج کل ہم جیلوں کے بارے میں اور قیدیوں کے متعلق معلومات اکٹھی کر رہے ہیں، تاکہ ہم یہ اچھی طرح سمجھ سکیں کہ جیلوں میں کیا حالات ہیں اور قیدی وہاں کیا محسوس کرتے ہیں؟

جو باتیں آپ کی اور میرے درمیان ہوں گی وہ میرے پاس رہیں گی اور کسی کا ان باتوں سے کوئی تعلق نہیں ہے۔ امید ہے کہ آپ ہماری مدد کریں گے اور میں جو کچھ آپ سے پوچھوں، وہ آپ اچھی طرح بتائیں گے۔ اس سے ہمیں ملک کے مسئلوں اور خاص طور پر جیل کے مسئلوں کو سمجھنے میں بڑی مدد ملے گی۔ آپ کی مہربانی اور شکریہ!

PART I : Demographic and Classifying Variables

- ۱- آپ پر کن کن دفعات کے تحت مقدمہ بنا؟ کون کون سا جرم ہوا؟ (ایک، ہی وقت اور ایک، ہی مقدمہ میں کون کون سا الزام لگا؟ (مقصد صرف جرم کی نوعیت کا پتہ چلانا ہے نہ کہ جرم کی وجوہات اور کیس ہسٹری جاننا، اس لئے اختصار سے کام لیں)۔
- ۲- کیا یہ جرم پلاننگ کے ساتھ، پہلے سے کئے ہوئے ارادے اور منصوبے کے ساتھ ہوا؟
ہاں _____ نہیں _____
- ۳- جرم کے وقت آپ کی عمر کیا تھی؟ _____ (سال) اور تعلیم کتنی تھی؟ _____ (سال)
- ۴- جرم کس جگہ پر ہوا؟ گاؤں _____ قصبہ _____ شہر _____
- ۵- دوسری پارٹی کون تھی؟ کیا آپ اسے جانتے تھے؟ _____ نہیں جانتے تھے؟ _____
کوئی شخص نہیں تھا؟ _____
- ۶- موجودہ واقعہ ہونے سے پہلے آپ شادی شدہ تھے؟ _____ ہاں _____ نہیں _____
- ۷- کیا آپ کے پاس پندرہ سال کی عمر کے بعد روزی کمانے کا کوئی وسیلہ بدستور رہا؟
ہاں _____ نہیں _____

۸- آپ کے اور آپ کی فیملی کے مالی حالات کیسے تھے؟ آپ دوسروں کے مقابلے میں اپنے آپ کو کس گروپ میں ڈالیں گے؟

بہت امیر امیر درمیانے غریب بہت غریب

PART II : Physically Broken Home

- ۱- بچپن میں آپ کس کے پاس رہے، آپ کو کس نے پالا؟
- ۲- کیا آپ کے والد زندہ ہیں؟
ہاں — نہیں —
اگر نہیں تو کب فوت ہوئے؟
اس وقت آپ کی عمر کیا تھی؟
- ۳- کیا آپ کی والدہ زندہ ہیں؟
ہاں — نہیں —
اگر نہیں تو کب فوت ہوئیں؟
اس وقت آپ کی عمر کیا تھی؟
- ۴- کیا آپ کے والدین کبھی ایک دوسرے سے علیحدہ بھی ہوئے؟
ہاں — نہیں —
اگر ہاں تو وجہ (پہلی دفعہ)
اس وقت آپ کی عمر کیا تھی؟
اس دوران آپ کہاں اور کیسے رہے؟
وجہ (دوسری اور زائد دفعہ)
اس وقت آپ کی عمر کیا تھی؟
اس دوران آپ کہاں اور کیسے رہے؟
- ۵- کیا آپ کے والد نے ایک سے زیادہ شادیاں کیں؟
ہاں — نہیں —
اگر ہاں تو اس وقت آپ کی عمر کیا تھی؟
- ۶- کیا ملازمت کی وجہ سے آپ کے والد صاحب کو بہت زیادہ عرصہ کے لئے باہر رہنا پڑا؟
ہاں — نہیں —
اگر ہاں تو نوعیت : عرصہ : اس وقت آپ کی عمر کیا تھی؟
ان کی غیر موجودگی میں گھر پر کون ہوتا تھا؟

Psychologically Disrupted Home

- ۱- گھروں میں عموماً ماں باپ کے درمیان اختلافات پیدا ہو جاتے ہیں، اور لڑائی جھگڑے بھی قدرتی سی بات ہے۔ آپ کے گھر میں اکثر کس بات پر اختلاف ہوتا تھا اور آپ کیا محسوس کرتے تھے؟
- ۲- کیا کبھی کبھی آپ اپنے گھر سے تنگ بھی آ جاتے تھے؟ (کیوں) اور پھر کیا کرتے تھے؟

- ۳- کیا آپ کبھی گھر چھوڑ کر چلے گئے تھے؟ (تفصیل):
- ۴- اچھا یاد کر کے بتائیں کہ کبھی آپ کے والد صاحب اور والدہ صاحبہ کے درمیان لڑائی بھی ہوئی تھی؟ (تفصیل): آپ کیا محسوس کرتے تھے، اس وقت آپ کی عمر کتنی تھی؟
- Control and Support
- ۱- گھر میں آپ کے والدین کا کنٹرول کیا تھا؟ (وقفہ) یعنی ڈسپلن اور اپنی بات پر عمل کروانا -
- ۲- بعض والدین بچوں کو بات نہ ماننے، کام نہ کرنے اور غلطی یا شرارت کرنے پر زیادہ کچھ نہیں کہتے، بعض مارتے ہیں اور بچوں کو کھینچ کر رکھتے ہیں، ہر وقت ڈانٹتے رہتے ہیں یا کوئی اور سزا دیتے ہیں - آپ کے والدین آپ کی نافرمانیوں، غلطیوں اور شرارتوں پر کیا کرتے تھے؟
- ۳- عموماً والدین بچوں کی تمام خواہشوں کو پورا نہیں کر سکتے، اور ان کی فیدوں کو نہیں مان سکتے، لیکن بعض والدین اپنے بچوں کی ہر بات مانتے ہیں، آپ کے والدین کیسے تھے؟
- ۴- عموماً والدین بچوں کی حرکات پر کڑی نگاہ رکھتے ہیں، ان کے گھر سے آنے جانے پر پوچھ گچھ ہوتی ہے، آپ کے والدین اس سلسلے میں کیا کرتے تھے، اور آپ کے والدین کا رویہ کیا ہوتا تھا؟
- ۵- والدین اپنے بچوں کو بہت ساری باتوں سے منع کرتے ہیں مثلاً بعض دوستوں سے ملنے اور بعض کاموں کے کرنے پر، کبھی تو وہ صحیح ہوتے ہیں اور کبھی خواہ مخواہ منع کرتے ہیں - آپ کے والدین کا اس سلسلے میں کیا رویہ تھا؟ کیا وہ آپ کو بعض دوستوں سے ملنے اور بعض کاموں کے کرنے سے منع کرتے تھے؟ (وقفہ) آپ کیا محسوس کرتے تھے؟

PART III : Past Criminal Record & Criminal Associations

- ۱- کیا آپ کی زندگی میں کوئی ایسا شخص تھا، جس کو پولیس اور عدالت کے ساتھ واسطہ پڑا - آپ ان کے ساتھ رہتے رہے ہوں؟ (تفصیل):
- (۱) والدین میں سے ہاں — نہیں —
- (۲) رشتہ داروں میں سے ہاں — نہیں —
- (۳) دوستوں یا رشتہ داروں میں سے ہاں — نہیں —
- ۲- اچھا یہ بتائیں کہ اس واقعہ (موجودہ مقدمہ اور سزا) سے پہلے بھی کبھی آپ پر مقدمہ بنا / یا پولیس اور عدالت سے واسطہ پڑا؟
- ہاں — نہیں —
- ۳- کیا کبھی اس موقع (موجودہ مقدمہ اور سزا) سے پہلے ایسا ہوا کہ آپ بے قصور تھے، لیکن آپ کو سزا ہوئی ہو؟ ہاں — نہیں —
- (اگر مندرجہ بالا دو سوالوں یعنی سوال نمبر ۲ اور ۳ میں سے کسی کا جواب " ہاں " میں ہو تو پارٹ ۱ کے پہلے چھ سوالات کے لئے اسی طرح کی شیٹ اور بھر لیں، ورنہ شکریہ ادا کر کے اگلے سوالات پر چلے جائیں) -

PART IV : Background, and Precipitating Causes

- ۱- تفصیل سے بتائیں کہ آپ پر یہ مقدمہ کیسے بنا؟ اور اس کی بیک گراؤنڈ کیا تھی؟
- ۲- جرم کیس طرح کیا گیا؟ یعنی کیا منصوبہ بنایا گیا، عمل کیس طرح ہوا؟

۱- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۲- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۳- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۴- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۱- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۲- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۳- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۱- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۲- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۳- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۴- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۵- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۶- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۷- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۸- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۹- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۱۰- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

۱۱- ایشیائی تہذیب کی بنیاد پر مشتمل ہے۔

- ۲۲۔ میں بڑی آسانی سے کسی بھی دوست سے دوستی ختم کر سکتا ہوں۔
- ۲۳۔ کسی سے روزگار یا ملازمت کے لیے درخواست کرتے وقت مجھ پر گھبرلاہٹ طاری ہو جاتی ہے۔
- ۲۴۔ کبھی کبھی میرے جی میں آتا تھا کہ اپنا گھر چھوڑ دوں۔
- ۲۵۔ میں اپنی شکل و صورت کے متعلق کبھی پریشان نہیں ہوتا۔
- ۲۶۔ میری گھر ملازمت کی ہمیشہ خوش گواری رہی ہے۔
- ۲۷۔ یوں لگتا ہے مجھ سے ایسے کام ہو جاتے ہیں جن پر میں دوسرے لوگوں سے زیادہ کچھتا ہوں۔
- ۲۸۔ میرے کھانے پینے کے طریقے اپنے گھر میں اتنے اچھے نہیں ہوتے، جتنے گھر سے باہر دوسروں کے ساتھ بیٹھ کر کھانے پیتے ہوئے ہوتے ہیں۔
- ۲۹۔ لوگ بحث میں مجھ سے بڑی آسانی سے جیت جاتے ہیں۔
- ۳۰۔ مجھے معلوم ہے کہ میرے بہت سے مشلوں اور مصیبتوں کا ذمہ دار کون ہے۔
- ۳۱۔ کوئی ہوشیار وکیل کسی مجرم کو بری کرنے میں کامیاب ہو جاتا ہے تو میں قانون سے سخت یاروں ہو جاتا ہوں۔
- ۳۲۔ میں نے کمزرت سے نشہ کیا ہے۔
- ۳۳۔ بعض اوقات میں گھر سے بھاگ جانا چاہتا تھا۔
- ۳۴۔ مجھے زندگی میں بہت سی سختیاں پہنی پڑی ہیں۔
- ۳۵۔ لوگ اکثر میری غیر موجودگی میں میرے بارے میں باتیں کرتے ہیں۔
- ۳۶۔ میں کسی ناواقف شخص سے کبھی شرط لگا کر تاش نہیں کھیلتا۔
- ۳۷۔ میرا خیال ہے کہ میں اتنا خوش نہیں ہوں جتنے دوسرے لوگ دکھائی دیتے ہیں۔
- ۳۸۔ جیب میں پھوٹا تھا تو کبھی کبھی چیزیں چرا لیا کرتا تھا۔
- ۳۹۔ بچپن میں میرا گھر دوسرے لوگوں کے گھروں کی نسبت کم پیمانے پر سکون تھا۔
- ۴۰۔ اسکول کے دنوں میں میں اپنے استادوں کو بہت تنگ کیا کرتا تھا۔
- ۴۱۔ اگر تنخواہ مناسب ہو تو میں کسی سکرٹس میں ملازمت کر کے مختلہ جگہوں پر سفر کرنا پسند کرتا ہوں۔
- ۴۲۔ میں نے کبھی اسکول کی زیادہ پرواہ نہیں کی۔
- ۴۳۔ میرے گھر والوں کے آپس میں تعلقات بہت اچھے رہے ہیں۔
- ۴۴۔ میرے والدین نے درحقیقت مجھے کبھی بھی نہیں سمجھا۔
- ۴۵۔ وہ شخص اچھا رہتا ہے جو کسی پر بھی بھروسہ نہیں کرتا۔

THE HAND TEST

Scoring Booklet

Edwin E. Wagner, Ph.D. and Howard M. Knoff, Ph.D.

Published by



WESTERN PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES
Publishers and Distributors
12031 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90025

Name: _____ Sex: _____ Race: _____

Address: _____ Phone: _____

ADULT

CHILD

Marital Status: _____

School Name: _____

Occupation: _____

Grade: _____

Highest Grade Completed _____

Teacher Name: _____

Date Tested: _____

Referred by: _____

Birthdate: _____










Reason for Referral: _____

Age at Time of Testing: _____

Qualitative Administrative Observations: _____

Case History and Diagnostic Data: _____

Examiner Name: _____

Card Number and Position	Initial Response Time	Position (e.g., >, <, ^, v)	Examinee Response	Scoring	
				Quantitative	Qualitative
					
					
					
					
					
					
					
					
					
Blank Card					

DATA ANALYSIS SHEET

(For coding see Definitions, Descriptions & Codes)

<u>VARIABLES</u>	<u>CODES</u>	<u>POSITION</u>
A1. a) Subject Number	_____	1-3 (1st line)
b) Jail (Peshawar 1, Lahore 2, Rawalpindi 3).	_____	5

OFFENSE RELATED VARIABLES

A2. Type of Crime latest (Codes 1,2,3,4,5,6, or 7)	_____	7
A3. Type of Crime 2nd last (as above)	_____	8
A4. Type of Crime 3rd last (as above)	_____	9
A5. Prof. or Non-prof. on type of crime latest (1 or 0)	-----	10
A6. Prof. or Non-prof. on type of crime 2nd last (1 or 0)	-----	11
A7. Prof. or Non-prof. on type of crime 3rd last (1 or 0)	-----	12
A8. Past Criminal Record (1 or 0)	_____	13
A9. Prof. or Non-prof. on Past Criminal Record (1 or 0)	-----	14
A10. Relationship with the victim (1,2 or 3)	_____	15
A11. Prof. or Non-prof. on relationship with victim (1 or 0)	-----	16
A12. Premeditation (1 or 0)	_____	17
A13. Prof. or Non-prof. on Premeditation (1 or 0)	-----	18
A14. Criminal Association (1 or 0)	_____	19
A15. Prof. or Non-prof. on Criminal Association (1 or 0)	_____	20
A16. Extent of Professionalness (Add "1"s on 5,6,7,9,11,13, &15)	-----	21
A16A Type of Criminal (Codes: 1 = Prof. 0= Non-Prof. (derived from A16)		
A16B = A16 - A5		
A16C = A16 - A6		
A16D = A16 - A7		
A16E = A16 - A9		
A16F = A16 - A11		

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

A17. Age at the commission of first ever crime (years)	_____	23-24
A18. Schooling (years)	_____	25-26
A19. Socio-Economic Status (1,2,3, or 4)	_____	27
A20. Occupational Pattern (1 or 0)	_____	28
A21. Marital Status before the first ever crime (1 or 0)	_____	29
A22. Venue of Crime (1 or 2)	_____	30
A23. Punishment (years)	_____	31-32
A24. Time spent in jail (years)	_____	33-34
A25. Time left in release (years)	_____	35-36

EARLY HOME ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

A28. Physically Broken Home (1 or 0)	_____	38
A29. Psychologically Disrupted Home (1 or 0)	_____	39
A30. Defective modes of discipline (1 or 0)	_____	40
A31. Psychological Adversity Scores (0,1,2, or 3)	_____	41

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

A32. Scores on ACL	_____	1-54 (2nd line)
A33. Scores on CPI	_____	56-57 (2nd line)
A34. Scores on Hand Test		
AFF to AGG	_____	59-64
ACQ to PAS	_____	66-68
TEN to FEAR	_____	70-72
DES to BEZ & FAIL	_____	74-76