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#### Abstract

Objective. The purpose of this research is to study the existence of differences in the pathological trends, depending on the biological nature of the persons deprived of their liberty. Participants and design. The subjects of this work are 60 . The selection criterion of the research group is the biological genre of the subjects. Because it is a comparative study between women and men, they are divided into two groups (each group having 30 subjects). The subjects on which the questionnaire was applied are persons deprived of their liberty, detainees at the Arad Penitentiary of Maximum Security, both the penitentiary of men and the women. The delinquents have been jailed for crimes such as theft, rape, murder. For this sample, the S.P. 13 questionnaire was used, the specific method being the survey method. The questionnaire was applied once for each subject. The sample was applied collectively, the maximum number of participants was 10 . Each subject had a questionnaire. He first explained the purpose and objectives of this paper, then went on to the questionnaire. After the misunderstandings were removed, they were asked to complete the questionnaire. I think the sample used did not have a time limit. Results. Based on the results obtained for this hypothesis, one can observe significant differences in pathological trends depending on the biological type. Conclusion. Compared to men, women get higher odds on the dimensions of psychostain, depression,


schizoid, paranoid tendencies, hysteroidal tendencies, and the dimension of immaturity and emotional lability. Men get higher odds compared to women on the scale of psychopathy and frustration.
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## Introduction:

The present paper aims to demonstrate that there are differences in the pathological trends, depending on the biological nature of the persons deprived of their liberty.

The motivation for choosing this theme is the continuation of the previous research titled, Identifying the differences in the level of aggression according to the biological genre of the subjects in the penitentiary environment. Because the specialized literature in our country is poorer in this respect, and the extensive studies in this field are missing or are at an early stage, they are applied locally but also involve a small number of detainees, so I considered that research was necessary to identify differences in pathological trends, depending on the biological type in persons deprived of their liberty;

## Research methodology

## The sample

The subjects of this work are 60 . The selection criterion of the research group is the biological genre of the subjects. Because it is a comparative study between women and men, they are divided into two groups (each group having 30 subjects). The subjects on which the questionnaire was applied are persons deprived of their liberty, detainees at the Arad Penitentiary of Maximum Security, both the penitentiary of men and the women. The delinquents have been jailed for crimes such as theft, rape, murder.
Working procedure
The subject's test mode was normal, no incidents. I worked in the two penitentiaries, in one of the clubs specially arranged for such events and under the close supervision of the penitentiary psychologist and at least two guards. The protector was applied once for each subject. The sample was applied collectively, the maximum number of participants was 10 . Each subject had a questionnaire and a questionnaire for them. He first explained the purpose and objectives of the study, then went on to the training of the sample. After the misunderstandings were removed, they were asked to complete the questionnaire. I think the sample used did not have a time limit.
Methods and tools used

For collecting the data, the S.P. 13.
This sample includes 130 items, 10 items for each dimension, with direct references to the 13 pathological trends. The 13 dimensions of the questionnaire are: validation scale, psycho-social antecedents, psychosis, depression, immaturity and emotional lability, schizoidism, paranoia, hysteria, psychopathy, mental level, frustration, emotional balance and motivation.
Responses are binary (YES or NO). The maximum quota for each trend 10 points, if 5 points are exceeded, a thorough evaluation of that trend is required.

## Results and discussions

Assumption: It is assumed that there are significant differences in the pathological trends, depending on the biological nature of the persons deprived of their liberty;

The results obtained by the subjects are presented in the following table. For this sample the S.P. 13 questionnaire was used, the specific method being the survey method.

Table 1.
Differences of the mean of the women and men according to the pathological trends.
Group Statistics

|  | GEN | $\mathbf{N}$ | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation <br> Error <br> Mean |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{V}$ | Women | 30 | 2.03 | 1.608 | .294 |
|  | Men | 30 | 1.40 | 1.070 | .195 |
| Ant | Women | 30 | 2.97 | 2.059 | .376 |
|  | Men | 30 | 2.87 | 1.925 | .351 |
| Psihastenia Women | 30 | 4.57 | 2.112 | .386 |  |
|  | Men | 30 | 4.20 | 2.469 | .451 |
| $\mathbf{D}$ | Women | 30 | 4.93 | 2.559 | .467 |
|  | Men | 30 | 4.07 | 2.959 | .540 |
| IL | Women | 30 | 4.30 | 2.423 | .442 |
|  | Men | 30 | 3.70 | 2.466 | .450 |


| Sch | Women | 30 | 4.90 | 1.954 | .357 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Men | 30 | 3.90 | 2.631 | .480 |
| Paranoia | Women | 30 | 5.10 | 2.524 | .461 |
|  | Men | 30 | 4.13 | 3.203 | .585 |
| HY | Women | 30 | 4.57 | 2.192 | .400 |
|  | Men | 30 | 2.60 | 1.905 | .348 |
| Pt | Women | 30 | 3.23 | 2.269 | .414 |
|  | Men | 30 | 3.60 | 2.860 | .522 |
| NM | Women | 30 | 3.50 | 1.889 | .345 |
|  | Men | 30 | 2.20 | 2.124 | .388 |
| M | Women | 30 | 2.50 | 1.943 | .355 |
|  | Men | 30 | 2.37 | 2.220 | .405 |
| EE | Women | 30 | 6.13 | 2.569 | .469 |
|  | Men | 30 | 5.80 | 2.565 | .468 |
| RE | Women | 30 | 2.80 | 1.827 | .334 |
|  | Men | 30 | 3.47 | 1.756 | .321 |

As can be seen from Table 1, it can be noticed that the differences between the two groups, both women and men, are conclusive, so there are significant differences in the pathological trends from a statistical point of view. In the case of differences depending on the biological type, it is worth discussing the following dimensions of the S.P. 13

Depression, on this dimension, one can notice that women have a higher average than men, so women are more affected than men. This may be due to the fact that women can move more easily through emotional states with a fairly broad spectrum, with oscillations between states of well-being and sadness, melancholy, lack of vitality, feeling of guilt, while men are more resistant to the environment penitentiary.

In the case of paranoid tendencies, there is an increased share in women, a rate indicating superiority in behavior and appreciation of personal availability as well as psycho-emotional rigidity. It can be said that the point of departure in this case is that women have some false premises about logical reasoning, have their own values and beliefs that no one changes.

Schizophrenia, a dimension indicating that women in prison have a type of schizoid thinking, are oriented towards the abstract, to themselves. A high rate indicates the presence of an autistic structure with discordant behavioral elements, the lack of the need for affective relationship, and the strangeness of behavior. The situation may be due to the fact that during detention, women focus more on themselves, restrict their field of interests, are strictly oriented towards basic needs.

Table 2. Significance of the differences in the mean of men and women in pathological trends

| Levene's <br> Test for <br> Equality of <br> Variances |  |  | T-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95 \% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |  |
|  | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. <br> (2- <br> tailed | Mean <br> Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| v | 3.564 | . 064 | 1.796 | 58 | . 078 | . 633 | . 353 | -. 072 | 1.339 |
|  |  |  | 1.796 | 50.474 | . 078 | . 633 | . 353 | -. 075 | 1.341 |
| Ant. | . 612 | . 437 | . 194 | 58 | . 847 | . 100 | . 515 | -. 930 | 1.130 |
|  |  |  | . 194 | 57.739 | . 847 | . 100 | . 515 | -. 930 | 1.130 |
| Psih | . 388 | . 536 | . 618 | 58 | . 539 | . 367 | . 593 | -. 821 | 1.554 |
|  |  |  | . 618 | 56.641 | . 539 | . 367 | . 593 | -. 821 | 1.555 |
| D | 1.398 | . 242 | 1.214 | 58 | . 230 | . 867 | . 714 | -. 563 | 2.296 |
|  |  |  | 1.214 | 56.818 | . 230 | . 867 | . 714 | -. 564 | 2.297 |
| IL | . 002 | . 965 | . 951 | 58 | . 346 | . 600 | . 631 | -. 663 | 1.863 |
|  |  |  | . 951 | 57.983 | . 346 | . 600 | . 631 | -. 663 | 1.863 |
| Sch | 4.184 | . 045 | 1.671 | 58 | . 100 | 1.00 | . 598 | -. 198 | 2.198 |
|  |  |  | 1.671 | 53.529 | . 100 | 1.00 | . 598 | -. 200 | 2.200 |


| Par | 2.560 | .115 | 1.298 | 58 | .199 | .967 | .744 | -.524 | 2.457 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | 1.298 | 54.992 | .200 | .967 | .744 | -.525 | 2.459 |
| HY | .462 | .499 | 3.709 | 58 | .000 | 1.967 | .530 | .905 | 3.028 |
|  |  |  | 3.709 | 56.890 | .000 | 1.967 | .530 | .905 | 3.028 |
| Pt | 1.351 | .250 | -.550 | 58 | .584 | -.367 | .667 | - | .968 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.701 |  |
|  |  |  | -.550 | 55.153 | .584 | -.367 | .667 | - | .969 |
| NM | .284 | .596 | 2.505 | 58 | .015 | 1.300 | .519 | .261 | 2.339 |
|  |  |  | 2.505 | 57.223 | .015 | 1.300 | .519 | .261 | 2.339 |
| M | .009 | .923 | .248 | 58 | .805 | .133 | .539 | -.945 | 1.212 |
|  |  |  | .248 | 56.998 | .805 | .133 | .539 | -.945 | 1.212 |
| EE | .001 | .981 | .503 | 58 | .617 | .333 | .663 | -.994 | 1.660 |
|  |  |  | .503 | 58.000 | .617 | .333 | .663 | -.994 | 1.660 |
| RE | .289 | .593 | - | 58 | .155 | -.667 | .463 | - | .260 |
|  |  |  | 1.441 |  |  |  |  | 1.593 |  |
|  |  |  | - | 57.910 | .155 | -.667 | .463 | - | .260 |
|  |  |  | 1.441 |  |  |  |  | 1.593 |  |

For Table 2, the "T" test was used. The "T" test is used to assess the statistical significance of differences in the mean of the biological genome and the pathological trends.
As can be seen from Table 2, it can be noticed that the differences between the two groups, ie men and women, at the level of the pathological tendencies, approach the threshold of statistical significance to the dimensions.

In the depressive dimension (S. 13) we can speak of a statistically significant result. Its value is $t=.242$, a situation that shows a difference between men and women in the present case. Thus, on this dimension it can be seen that women have a higher average than men, so women are more affected than men. This may be due to the fact that women can move more easily
through emotional states with a fairly broad spectrum, with oscillations between states of well-being and sadness, melancholy, lack of vitality, feeling of guilt, while men are more resistant to the environment penitentiary.

Another significant result is immaturity and emotional lability; is another dimension where women get a higher average. Its value is $t=.965$. Women in the penitentiary environment have a higher average than men. This dimension refers to the late emotional-emotional development. Women in the penitentiary environment are lately aware of the seriousness of the deeds and will stay away from their children. The lack of children affects them emotionally, they become much more sensitive compared to men when it comes to family and children. It follows that women need too much family or people with whom they have a close connection, especially feeling the lack of children becoming more concerned with family, children than men.

Hysteroidal trends, this dimension highlights the desire to value, the demonstrativeness, the suggestiveness. Its value is $t=.499$. Women have a much higher average than men, this may be due to the fact that women generally conserve these demonstration behaviors even if they end up in a deprivation of freedom. In this environment, what is happening is nothing more than an exacerbation of demonstration behavior, of course, with the objective of displaying a strong personality that intimidates the opponent and who, all the time, this personality puts his or her own needs, desires, goals. An increased share reflects a tendency towards theatricality, manners, exaggerated "self" dependence, desire to be noticed, regardless of the processes. These behavioral "trumps" generally make use of women in this environment, and as such we have far greater results on this dimension than men who do not use such behavioral luggage in this deprivation of freedom. This is probably due to the fact that men do not use such behavior. It may also be due to the fact that it is behavior that does not characterize the prisoner man in the penitentiary environment.

Conclusion: Following the results obtained for this hypothesis, one can observe the significant differences in the pathological tendencies according to the biological type, so the hypothesis is plausible.

Compared to men, women get higher odds on the dimensions of psychostain, depression, schizoid, paranoid tendencies, hysteroidal tendencies, and the dimension of immaturity and emotional lability. Men get higher odds compared to women on the scale of psychopathy and frustration.
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