

Research Paper

A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders

Silvia Dutta^{1*}

ABSTRACT

Criminology has historically received comparatively little scholarly attention in India, unlike in many other countries where it is well established alongside other social and applied sciences. Against this backdrop, the present study set out to examine criminal thinking and aggression in convicted homicide offenders ($N=100$, $M=50$, $F=50$) using a quantitative design. Data were gathered with the Texas Christian University Criminal Thinking Scale (TCU-CTS; Knight, Garner, Simpson, Morey, & Flynn, 2006) and the Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ; Buss & Perry, 1992), and analyzed through descriptive statistics (mean, SD), independent-samples t-tests with equal group sizes, and Pearson product-moment correlations. Findings indicated significant group differences on several psycho-social dimensions—entitlement, justification, power orientation, cold-heartedness, criminal rationalization, physical aggression, verbal aggression, and hostility—along with meaningful correlations among specific dimensions within each group.

Keywords: *Criminal Thinking, Aggression, Homicide Offenders, Gender Differences*

As the scientific study of crime, criminology addresses both the reasons individuals violate the law and the ways society defines and responds to such violations. Historically, accounts of criminal behavior have taken varied forms—from demonological explanations that blamed wrongdoing on possession by evil spirits requiring exorcism or banishment, to the classical free-will perspective of Beccaria and Bentham, which viewed behavior as the outcome of a rational calculation weighing expected pleasure against expected pain (Barnes & Teeters, 1959). Biological positivists, most notably Lombroso (1876), initially argued that criminals constituted a distinct and physically recognizable “born” type, a position that was substantially revised once subjected to empirical testing. Later, multiple-causation theorists contended that criminal behavior is best explained not by any single factor but by the interplay of social, economic, physical, geographic, and political influences.

Contemporary national crime statistics reinforce why studying homicide and gender-linked offending patterns matters today. According to the National Crime Records Bureau, India registered 27,721 murder cases in 2023, down 2.8% from 28,522 cases the previous year, even as total cognizable crimes rose to 62,41,569. During the same year, 4,48,211 crimes

¹PhD Scholar, Bharathiar University

*Corresponding Author

Received: September 03, 2026; Revision Received: September 20, 2026; Accepted: September 26, 2026

© 2026, Dutta, S.; licensee IJIP. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders

against women were reported, of which 6,156 were dowry-related deaths. Data from the subsequent Crime in India 2024 report show this is not a single-year fluctuation: murder cases fell by a further 2.4% and crimes against women by 1.5% compared with 2023, while the national cognizable-crime rate dropped by 6.0% overall (NCRB, 2024). These figures capture only reported incidents rather than true prevalence, yet the persistence of tens of thousands of murders and hundreds of thousands of crimes against women annually confirms that violent crime remains a pressing social issue in which gender plays a meaningful role. It is against this backdrop that studying the psychological profile of convicted homicide offenders—particularly through a direct comparison of men and women within one empirical framework—takes on added relevance (NCRB, 2023, 2024).

Even so, women's criminality and its psychological underpinnings remain an understudied area within Indian research. As industrialization, urbanization, and globalization have broadened and diversified the roles women occupy in public life, the traditional assumption that women are inherently less prone to crime deserves fresh empirical testing. Research that includes both genders also carries practical value, since knowing where male and female offenders converge and diverge on key psycho-social dimensions can shape more sensitive, gender-informed approaches to custody and rehabilitation.

A body of empirical research on criminal thinking and aggression lays the groundwork for this kind of comparison. Employing the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles, Megreya (2013) observed inverse relationships between several criminal-thinking styles and emotional intelligence in a sample of Egyptian offenders. Champion (2017) documented a small but positive link between criminal entitlement and tolerance for interpersonal violence, while Sinha (2016) characterized criminal thinking as a pattern that takes shape early in life and is strengthened through continued offending. By contrast, Morgan et al. (2015) found no meaningful difference in criminal thinking between people who had merely imagined committing an offense and those who had witnessed one, casting doubt on how stable such thought patterns are across situations. Turning to aggression, the meta-analytic work of Eagly and Steffen (1986) confirmed that men tend to display more aggression than women overall, especially in its physical form, whereas Assari et al. (2014) identified a significant testosterone–violence link among female participants that did not hold for males—complicating any straightforward biological explanation of the gender gap in aggression. Brad et al. (2014) found scant evidence that hostility distinguishes homicide offenders from other violent offenders, and Baris (2015) noted that a considerable share of incarcerated women had killed abusive partners, pointing to lethal violence among women as more often reactive and defensive than predatory in nature.

This study carries significance on multiple fronts. Women's involvement in crime continues to be a sensitive and under-examined topic within Indian scholarship, even though rising crime figures and evolving social structures suggest that treating women as inherently law-abiding is an increasingly dated view. Additionally, since earlier research on criminal thinking and aggression has largely relied on all-male samples, incorporating female participants here permits a more direct assessment of where gender differences genuinely exist and where they do not. Finally, given that correctional programming is usually built around a one-size-fits-all offender profile, insights into the psychological differences between male and female homicide offenders can support rehabilitation and resocialization efforts that are better matched to each group's specific needs.

A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders

Aim of the Study

Collectively, prior work suggests that criminal thinking and aggression are central psychological features of violent offending, even though how they manifest may vary by gender. Yet few studies have looked at both constructs together among male and female homicide convicts, especially in India. To fill this gap, the present study compared male and female convicted homicide offenders across dimensions of criminal thinking (entitlement, justification, power orientation, cold-heartedness, criminal rationalization, and personal irresponsibility) and aggression (physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility), and further explored how these dimensions relate to one another within each group. The specific objectives were to (a) compare the two groups on criminal-thinking dimensions, (b) compare them on aggression dimensions, and (c) examine correlations between criminal-thinking and aggression dimensions separately for men and women.

METHODS

Participants

The sample consisted of 100 eligible participants (50 men, 50 women), all first-time offenders between 18 and 55 years of age, from poor-to-middle socioeconomic backgrounds and native to West Bengal, with no reported psychiatric history. Spree, mass, and serial killers, offenders convicted on additional charges beyond homicide, and anyone reporting a psychiatric history were excluded from the study.

Measures

- **Criminal Thinking Scale (TCU-CTS; Knight et al., 2006).** This 36-item measure captures six dimensions of criminal thinking—entitlement, justification, power orientation, cold-heartedness, criminal rationalization, and personal irresponsibility—with subscale reliability coefficients reported between .66 and .84, and concurrent validity coefficients ranging from .68 to .81.
- **Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ; Buss & Perry, 1992).** This 29-item tool assesses four aggression dimensions—physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility—and has shown strong internal consistency overall (Cronbach's $\alpha \approx .89$), with acceptable-to-good reliability across each of its subscales.

Procedure

Each participant was interviewed individually within the correctional facility to build rapport before completing the questionnaires under the researcher's supervision. Responses that were inconsistent, incomplete, or missing were dropped from the dataset. Participants received a consent letter outlining the study's purpose and guaranteeing confidentiality, and only those who agreed to participate were retained in the sample.

Prior to data collection, informed consent was taken from each participant individually, with the study's purpose, procedures, and voluntary nature explained in a language and manner appropriate to their comprehension. Given the correctional setting, participants were assured that their decision to participate or withdraw at any point would have no bearing on their legal proceedings or institutional treatment, and that their responses would remain strictly confidential and anonymized in reporting. Consent was also obtained from the relevant correctional facility authorities to conduct the study within the premises.

A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders

Analyses were carried out in IBM SPSS 23. Means and standard deviations were calculated for both groups across all scales and subscales, independent-samples t-tests assessed group differences, and Pearson product-moment correlations examined relationships among the dimensions within each group, with significance set at the .05 level.

RESULTS

Results of the independent-samples t-tests showed that male offenders scored significantly higher than their female counterparts on five of the six criminal-thinking dimensions—entitlement, justification, power orientation, cold-heartedness, and criminal rationalization—whereas personal irresponsibility did not differ significantly between groups (see Table 1). For aggression, males again scored significantly higher than females on physical aggression, verbal aggression, and hostility, with anger showing no significant group difference (see Table 2).

Table 1: Differences Between Groups on Dimensions of Criminal Thinking

Dimension	Group	M	SD	t
Entitlement (EN)	Males	18.38	5.29	2.353*
	Females	16.24	3.66	
Justification (JU)	Males	19.76	5.13	2.793**
	Females	17.24	3.79	
Power Orientation (PO)	Males	22.10	5.51	2.183*
	Females	19.64	5.76	
Cold-Heartedness (CH)	Males	13.94	5.30	2.327*
	Females	11.62	4.65	
Criminal Rationalization (CN)	Males	25.46	3.93	4.188**
	Females	22.00	4.32	
Personal Irresponsibility (PI)	Males	20.32	4.51	0.915
	Females	19.54	4.01	

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

As summarized in Table 1, male offenders obtained significantly higher scores than female offenders on entitlement ($M = 18.38$, $SD = 5.29$ vs. $M = 16.24$, $SD = 3.66$; $t = 2.353^*$), justification ($M = 19.76$, $SD = 5.13$ vs. $M = 17.24$, $SD = 3.79$; $t = 2.793^{**}$), power orientation ($M = 22.10$, $SD = 5.51$ vs. $M = 19.64$, $SD = 5.76$; $t = 2.183^*$), cold-heartedness ($M = 13.94$, $SD = 5.30$ vs. $M = 11.62$, $SD = 4.65$; $t = 2.327^*$), and criminal rationalization ($M = 25.46$, $SD = 3.93$ vs. $M = 22.00$, $SD = 4.32$; $t = 4.188^{**}$). No significant group difference emerged on personal irresponsibility ($M = 20.32$, $SD = 4.51$ vs. $M = 19.54$, $SD = 4.01$; $t = 0.915$, ns).

Table 2: Differences Between Groups on Dimensions of Aggression

Dimension	Group	M	SD	t
Physical Aggression	Males	27.82	8.84	3.030**
	Females	22.46	8.85	
Verbal Aggression	Males	19.02	4.25	2.062*
	Females	17.22	4.48	
Anger	Males	22.64	6.49	1.047
	Females	21.22	7.06	
Hostility	Males	28.62	6.29	2.372*
	Females	25.08	8.47	

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders

Table 2 similarly presents means, standard deviations, and t-values comparing the two groups on the four aggression dimensions, showing that men scored significantly higher than women on physical aggression ($M = 27.82$, $SD = 8.84$ vs. $M = 22.46$, $SD = 8.85$; $t = 3.030^{**}$), verbal aggression ($M = 19.02$, $SD = 4.25$ vs. $M = 17.22$, $SD = 4.48$; $t = 2.062^{*}$), and hostility ($M = 28.62$, $SD = 6.29$ vs. $M = 25.08$, $SD = 8.47$; $t = 2.372^{*}$). Anger did not differ significantly between groups ($M = 22.64$, $SD = 6.49$ vs. $M = 21.22$, $SD = 7.06$; $t = 1.047$, ns).

Table 3: Correlations Among Dimensions of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Males

Dimension	EN	JU	PO	CH	CN	PI
Physical Aggression	.348*	.068	.581**	.510**	.287*	.572**
Verbal Aggression	.192	.045	.490**	.356*	.185	.347*
Anger	.313*	.088	.555**	.577**	.155	.509**
Hostility	.231	.148	.506**	.161	.292*	.493**

Note. EN = Entitlement; JU = Justification; PO = Power Orientation; CH = Cold-Heartedness; CN = Criminal Rationalization; PI = Personal Irresponsibility. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

As shown in Table 3, among male offenders both power orientation ($r = .581^{**}$, $.490^{**}$, $.555^{**}$, and $.506^{**}$ with physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility, respectively) and personal irresponsibility ($r = .572^{**}$, $.347^{*}$, $.509^{**}$, and $.493^{**}$, respectively) were positively correlated with all four aggression dimensions. Cold-heartedness correlated positively with physical aggression ($r = .510^{**}$), verbal aggression ($r = .356^{*}$), and anger ($r = .577^{**}$), while entitlement was positively related to physical aggression ($r = .348^{*}$) and anger ($r = .313^{*}$). Criminal rationalization correlated positively with physical aggression ($r = .287^{*}$) and hostility ($r = .292^{*}$), and justification showed no significant relationship with any aggression dimension.

Table 4: Correlations Among Dimensions of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Females

Dimension	EN	JU	PO	CH	CN	PI
Physical Aggression	.510**	.127	.809**	.625**	.126	.607**
Verbal Aggression	.145	.148	.623**	.444**	.240	.521**
Anger	.230	.113	.703**	.481**	.146	.678**
Hostility	.030	.013	.580**	.269	.307*	.556**

Note. EN = Entitlement; JU = Justification; PO = Power Orientation; CH = Cold-Heartedness; CN = Criminal Rationalization; PI = Personal Irresponsibility. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

For female offenders, Table 4 shows that power orientation ($r = .809^{**}$, $.623^{**}$, $.703^{**}$, and $.580^{**}$ with physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility, respectively) and personal irresponsibility ($r = .607^{**}$, $.521^{**}$, $.678^{**}$, and $.556^{**}$, respectively) were positively correlated with all four aggression dimensions. Cold-heartedness was positively related to physical aggression ($r = .625^{**}$), verbal aggression ($r = .444^{**}$), and anger ($r = .481^{**}$), entitlement correlated positively with physical aggression ($r = .510^{**}$), and criminal rationalization correlated positively with hostility ($r = .307^{*}$). As with the male sample, justification showed no significant association with any aggression dimension.

DISCUSSION

Overall, these results indicate that male and female homicide offenders differ in how strongly they endorse certain dimensions of criminal thinking and express certain forms of

A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders

aggression, even as they share several important psychological correlates of aggression. This pattern points toward a rehabilitative approach that is gender-sensitive without being exclusively gender-specific (Daly & Maher, 1998; Britton, 2000). Treatment programs may need to target cognitive distortions—entitlement, justification, rationalization, dominance-oriented thinking, and the externalization of responsibility—alongside aggressive behavior and hostility. Because several associations held across both groups, accountability-focused and cognitive-behavioral interventions appear relevant to male and female offenders alike, though the specific content should be tailored to each individual's psychological profile.

The results for cold-heartedness warrant careful interpretation. This dimension was significantly related to physical aggression, verbal aggression, and anger in both groups, but not to hostility in either group—indicating a largely comparable pattern of association across sexes rather than a stronger link to aggression specifically among women. This shared pattern underscores the value of considering emotional detachment alongside other criminal-thinking traits when interpreting aggression among convicted homicide offenders, and aligns with evidence that cold, callous, psychopathic-like traits are not restricted to men but can appear, sometimes more subtly, in women as well (Mallet, 2017).

Another notable finding is that personal irresponsibility did not differ by gender yet was positively associated with all four aggression dimensions in both groups. This suggests that a diminished sense of personal accountability—consistent with sociological theories of neutralization and denial of responsibility among offenders (Ahuja, 1996)—may be a correlate of aggression common to both men and women in this sample. For rehabilitation purposes, this implies that interventions promoting responsibility-taking and reducing blame externalization could benefit offenders of either gender rather than just one.

One striking result is the particularly strong link between power orientation and physical aggression among female offenders, along with its robust associations with anger, verbal aggression, and hostility—a pattern consistent with theoretical models describing the power motive as a drive to control and influence others (McClelland, 1987). This finding calls for cautious interpretation, however, since the study's design cannot determine whether power orientation drives aggression, aggression fuels power-oriented thinking, or a third factor accounts for both. Even so, the pattern suggests that dominance-related cognitions deserve attention in psychological assessment and rehabilitation for both male and female offenders.

A few gender-specific patterns also emerged. Entitlement was significantly related to both physical aggression and anger among male offenders, but only to physical aggression—not anger—among female offenders, a distinction consistent with prior work linking entitlement to exploitative and aggressive tendencies (Pelham & Hetts, 2001; Reidy et al., 2008). Similarly, criminal rationalization was significantly related to physical aggression and hostility in men but only to hostility in women, while justification showed no significant relationship with aggression in either group. Such findings suggest that specific facets of criminal thinking may relate differently to aggression depending on gender, echoing ongoing debate over whether the psychological correlates of aggression are truly symmetric or gender-specific across sexes (Dutton & Nicholls, 2005). It should be noted, however, that this study did not formally test whether these correlations differed significantly between men and women; the numerical differences observed should therefore be treated as descriptive rather than as statistically confirmed gender differences in association strength.

A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders

The correlational data more broadly confirm that criminal-thinking dimensions relate to aggression in both groups. Power orientation and personal irresponsibility were positively correlated with all four aggression dimensions among men and women alike, and cold-heartedness was positively linked to physical aggression, verbal aggression, and anger in both groups. This convergence suggests that dominance-oriented thinking, a reduced sense of accountability, and emotional detachment may be important correlates of aggression among convicted homicide offenders regardless of gender—consistent with research showing that women can display dominance-driven aggression to a degree comparable with men in certain interpersonal settings (Conradi et al., 2009). Because these are correlational findings, they cannot be taken to mean that criminal thinking causes aggression, or the reverse.

Turning to aggression, significant gender differences appeared for physical aggression, verbal aggression, and hostility—all higher among men—while anger showed no significant group difference. This pattern implies that gender differences may be more evident in the outward behavioral and attitudinal expression of aggression than in the underlying experience of anger. It aligns with meta-analytic evidence pointing to greater male involvement in overt aggression, particularly its physical form (Eagly & Steffen, 1986). At the same time, the lack of a significant anger difference suggests that the emotional arousal underlying aggression may not necessarily vary by gender among convicted homicide offenders, even if its behavioral manifestation is still shaped by situational and contextual factors unique to each group (Hamberger, 1997).

Higher entitlement scores among men fit with existing literature linking entitlement and self-enhancing cognitions to aggressive or antisocial conduct. This does not imply, however, that women lack entitlement or other criminal-thinking traits altogether; rather, women simply scored lower on average across several dimensions, which aligns with a growing move away from older assumptions that women's criminality is inherently more passive or psychologically restrained than men's (Simon, 1975; Schauer, 2006). Particularly noteworthy is the lack of a gender gap in personal irresponsibility, which suggests that externalizing or minimizing responsibility may occur among both male and female homicide offenders, notwithstanding differences on other criminal-thinking dimensions.

Taken as a whole, the study's results demonstrate gender differences across several criminal-thinking dimensions among convicted homicide offenders, with men scoring significantly higher than women on entitlement, justification, power orientation, cold-heartedness, and criminal rationalization, and no difference emerging for personal irresponsibility. These elevated male scores point to a stronger endorsement of thinking patterns tied to self-enhancement, behavioral justification, dominance, emotional detachment, and the rationalization of offending—patterns that depart from older criminological narratives portraying female offenders as psychologically simpler or less calculating than men (Lombroso & Ferrero, 1895/2004). Given the study's cross-sectional, self-report design, however, these differences are best understood as group-level differences in reported psychological characteristics rather than evidence of underlying causal processes.

CONCLUSION

This study found that male and female convicted homicide offenders differed significantly on entitlement, justification, power orientation, cold-heartedness, criminal rationalization, physical aggression, verbal aggression, and hostility, with men scoring higher on every one

A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders

of these dimensions, while personal irresponsibility and anger showed no significant group difference. In both groups, power orientation and personal irresponsibility were significantly and positively correlated with all four aggression dimensions, and cold-heartedness was consistently linked to physical aggression, verbal aggression, and anger—together suggesting that dominance-oriented thinking, emotional detachment, and reduced accountability may be shared correlates of aggression among convicted offenders.

Limitations

Several limitations qualify these findings: (a) time constraints restricted the sample to 100 participants, limiting generalizability; (b) all participants came from correctional facilities in West Bengal, which limits geographic generalizability; (c) limited prior research in this socio-cultural setting constrained the available comparative literature; (d) some responses had to be excluded due to inconsistency or incompleteness; and (e) incarceration duration among participants ranged from 5 to 14 years and was not statistically controlled for, which may have affected their responses.

Implications

Notwithstanding these constraints, the study makes several contributions. It adds to the limited literature on under-researched criminal-thinking dimensions such as entitlement, power orientation, and personal irresponsibility, and its direct comparison of male and female offenders helps offset the historical dominance of male-only samples in offender research. The findings can also inform gender-sensitive rehabilitation programs, especially those addressing cognitive distortions, responsibility-taking, dominance-oriented thinking, and aggressive behavior.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future studies could (a) explore additional psycho-social variables beyond criminal thinking and aggression, (b) conduct cross-cultural comparisons, (c) draw on larger and more geographically diverse samples to strengthen generalizability, (d) compare offenders across social classes, including high-profile cases, (e) extend the inquiry to serial, multiple, and juvenile offenders, and (f) investigate how incarceration duration affects criminal thinking and aggression.

REFERENCES

- Ahuja, R. (1996). *Sociological criminology*. New Age International Publishers.
- Assari, S., Caldwell, C. H., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2014). Sex differences in the association between testosterone and violent behaviors. *Trauma Monthly, 19*(3), e18040. <https://doi.org/10.5812/traumamon.18040>
- Baris, G. (2015). Female prisoners' motivations of violent crimes: Defensive or aggressive? *The Journal of International Social Research, 8*(39).
- Barnes, H. E., & Teeters, N. K. (1959). *New horizons in criminology* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Brad, C. A., Coupland, R. B. A., & Olver, M. E. (2014). An examination of mental health, hostility, and typology in homicide offenders. *Homicide Studies, 18*, 323–341.
- Britton, D. M. (2000). Feminism in criminology: Engendering the outlaw. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 571*, 57–76.
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 452–459.

A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders

- Champion, D. (2017). Personality correlates of criminal entitlement as a function of integral theory. *Forensic Research & Criminology International Journal*, 5(2).
- Conradi, L., Geffner, R., Hamberger, L. K., & Lawson, G. (2009). An exploratory study of women as dominant aggressors of physical violence in their intimate relationships. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 18(7), 718–738.
- Daly, K., & Maher, L. (1998). Crossroads and intersections: Building from feminist critique. In K. Daly & L. Maher (Eds.), *Criminology at the crossroads: Feminist readings in crime and justice* (pp. 1–17). Oxford University Press.
- Dutton, D. G., & Nicholls, T. L. (2005). The gender paradigm in domestic violence research and theory: Part 1—The conflict of theory and data. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 10.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100(3), 309–330.
- Hamberger, L. K. (1997). Female offenders in domestic violence: A look at actions in their context. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*.
- Knight, K., Garner, B. R., Simpson, D. D., Morey, J. T., & Flynn, P. M. (2006). An assessment for criminal thinking. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52(1), 159–177.
- Lombroso, C. (1876). *L'uomo delinquente* [The criminal man]. Hoepli.
- Lombroso, C., & Ferrero, G. (2004). *Criminal woman, the prostitute, and the normal woman*. Duke University Press. (Original work published 1895)
- Mallet, X. (2017). Women can be psychopaths too, in ways more subtle but just as dangerous. *The Conversation*.
- McClelland, D. C. (1987). *Human motivation*. Scott, Foresman.
- Megreya, A. (2013). *Criminal thinking styles and emotional intelligence in Egyptian offenders* [Unpublished manuscript]. Umm Al-Qura University.
- Morgan, R. D., Batastini, A. B., & Murray, D. D. (2015). Criminal thinking: A fixed or fluid process? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42(10).
- National Crime Records Bureau. (2023). *Crime in India 2023*. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.
- National Crime Records Bureau. (2024). *Crime in India 2024*. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.
- Pelham, B. W., & Hetts, J. J. (2001). Underworked and overpaid: Elevated entitlement in men's self-pay. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 93–103.
- Reidy, D. E., Zeichner, A., Foster, J. D., & Martinez, M. A. (2008). Effects of narcissistic entitlement and exploitativeness on human physical aggression. *Personality and Individual Differences*.
- Schauer, E. J. (2006). Women, law, and social control (2nd ed.) [Book review]. *The Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice*, 3(2).
- Simon, R. J. (1975). *Women and crime*. Lexington Books.
- Sinha, S. (2016). Personality correlates of criminals. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*.

A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders

Acknowledgment

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Dutta, S. (2026). A Comparative Study of Criminal Thinking and Aggression Among Male and Female Convicted Homicide Offenders. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 14(3), 2097-2106. DIP:18.01.192.20261403, DOI:10.25215/1403.192