

1-1-2005

Understanding psychopathy and violence: The role of motivation

Jacqueline Patricia Camp
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/rtds>

Repository Citation

Camp, Jacqueline Patricia, "Understanding psychopathy and violence: The role of motivation" (2005).
UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations. 2219.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.25669/e1bh-ml1y>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

UNDERSTANDING PSYCHOPATHY AND VIOLENCE:
THE ROLE OF MOTIVATION

by

Jacqueline Patricia Camp

Bachelor of Arts
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2004

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

**Master of Arts Degree in Psychology
Department of Psychology
College of Liberal Arts**

**Graduate College
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas
December 2007**

UMI Number: 1452230

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1452230

Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346



Thesis Approval

The Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

May 1, 2007

The Thesis prepared by

Jacqueline Patricia Camp

Entitled

Understanding Psychopathy and Violence: The Role of Motivation

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Psychology

Examination Committee Chair

Dean of the Graduate College

Examination Committee Member

Examination Committee Member

Graduate College Faculty Representative

ABSTRACT

Understanding Psychopathy and Violence: The Role of Motivation

by

Jacqueline Patricia Camp

Dr. Kim Barchard, Examination Committee Co-Chair
Assistant Professor of Psychology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Dr. Jennifer Skeem, Examination Committee Co-Chair
Associate Professor of Psychology
University of California, Irvine

Psychopathy has become of considerable interest to the legal system because of its reliable association with violence. Although psychopathy is largely defined by the PCL-R, this measure has been heavily criticized (1) for inclusion of specific counts of antisocial behavior and (2) for identifying a heterogeneous group of individuals who differ systematically in their basic personality dimensions. These criticisms have led to several questions regarding the nature of the relation between core psychopathy and violence. The present study sought to clarify the nature of the relationship between psychopathy and violence by (a) examining the unique relationship between core psychopathy and violence and (b) examining subgroups of psychopathic individuals and their propensity and motivation for violence in a sample of 189 offenders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	6
Understanding Psychopathy	6
The Empirical Association Between Psychopathy and Violence	22
Different Psychopaths, Different Violence?	32
Integration: A Nuanced View of Psychopathy and Violence.....	44
Study Aims.....	46
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	49
The NIMH Study.....	50
The Follow-up Study	58
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSES AND RESULTS.....	76
Psychopathy Dimensions and Violence	76
Psychopathy Subtypes and Violence.....	91
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION.....	96
Primary Findings.....	97
Limitations	109
Implications for Practice	111
Implications for Research	114
APPENDICES	116
Recent Violence Interview.....	116
Aggressive Incident Interview	121
AICS Ratings	125
Enhanced Goals for Violence	127
Record Review.....	133
BIBLIOGRAPHY	138

VITA	159
------------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Cleckley's (1941) Criteria for Psychopathic Personality Disorder	7
Table 2	PCL-R Criteria for Psychopathic Personality Disorder	11
Table 3	Traditional Two-Factor Model of PCL-R Psychopathy.....	12
Table 4	DSM-IV-TR Criteria for Antisocial Personality Disorder	15
Table 5	Cooke & Michie's (2001) Three-Factor Model of PCL-R Psychopathy	18
Table 6	Hare's Fourth Factor	19
Table 7	Correlation Matrix for the Four PCL-R Factors	54
Table 8	PCL-R Score Comparisons in Prison vs. Substance Abuse Participants.....	61
Table 9	PCL-R Score Comparisons in NIMH vs. Follow-up Sample	62
Table 10	Frequency of Violent Acts	66
Table 11	Interrater Reliability: Recent Violence Ratings	67
Table 12	Interrater Reliability: AICS Ratings.....	73
Table 13	Interrater Reliability: Goals for Violence	73
Table 14	Bivariate Relationship Between PCL-R Psychopathy and Any Violence	78
Table 15	Bivariate Relationship Between PCL-R Psychopathy and Serious Violence ..	79
Table 16	Bivariate Relationship Between PCL-R Psychopathy and Violence for Prison and Substance abuse Participants.....	80
Table 17	Logistic Model for Testing the Incremental Validity of Emotional Detachment PCL-R Factor in Predicting Violence	82
Table 18	Logistic Model for Testing the Incremental Validity of the Interpersonal and Affective PCL-R Factors in Predicting Violence.....	82
Table 19	Maximal Violence Prediction	83
Table 20	Partial Correlations: The Unique Relationship Between PCL-R Psychopathy and Motivation for Violence and Goals for Lifetime Violence (Prison) ...	88
Table 21	Partial Correlations: The Unique Relationship Between PCL-R Psychopathy and Motivation for Violence and Goals for Lifetime Violence (SA)	90
Table 22	Frequency of Future Violence.....	92
Table 23	Primary vs. Secondary Psychopaths and Lifetime Motivation for Violence ...	93
Table 24	Primary vs. Secondary Psychopaths and Goals for Lifetime Violence.....	94
Table 25	Primary vs. Secondary Psychopaths and PCL-R Scores.....	95

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my committee chairs, Drs. Jennifer Skeem and Kim Barchard, who made this project possible and whose contributions to the development and completion of this research are innumerable. I would also like to thank my committee members, Drs. Douglas Ferraro, Karen Kemtes, and Joel Lieberman for their support and commitment to the completion of this project. I would also like to acknowledge the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) and UNLV for the funding of this project and Ms. Sims for kindly facilitating access to the Southern Nevada Correctional Facilities. Finally, my sincere gratitude to the many research assistants who worked on one or several stages of this project, including Jenny Tiemann, Melissa Artstein, Shyenne Pougher, Paula Emke-Francis, Christopher Speirer, Coreen Ozawa, Denee' Grauberger, Erin Williams, and Sarah Morter.

Finally, I would like to extend my deepest love and gratitude to all of my family and friends who have given me all the support and guidance that I could ever ask for. I would like to dedicate this thesis to my mother, Barbara Ann Camp, whose love and unfaltering belief in me has made the unreachable seem reachable and whose memory will live on in my heart and in every moment of my life.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Psychopathy is a personality disorder characterized by affective (e.g., emotional detachment, callousness), interpersonal (e.g., egocentricity, superficial charm) and lifestyle (e.g., impulsivity, hostility) features. Psychopathy is viewed as a relatively rare disorder: one that affects less than one-quarter of prison inmates, less than 15% of psychiatric patients, and less than 1% of the general population (Hare, 1996). The most widely used measure of psychopathy is the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 1991, 2003). Although the PCL-R was developed as a diagnostic tool for psychopathy, it has become the most commonly used instrument for assessing individuals' risk of future violence (Tolman & Mullendore, 2003).

Psychopathy has been called a “construct whose time has come” (Hare, 1996), but investigators have begun to raise concerns about the modern operationalization of this construct. The PCL-R differs from seminal theories and clinical conceptions of psychopathy (Lilienfeld, 1994, 1998; Skeem & Cooke, in press). Whereas seminal theories of psychopathy focus narrowly on interpersonal and affective traits of emotional detachment (Cleckley, 1941), the PCL-R adds specific counts of antisocial behavior to its definition of this personality disorder (Hare, 1991). This may be inappropriate, as antisocial behavior can be based on a host of factors other than psychopathic personality

deviation (e.g., substance abuse, socioeconomic disadvantage; Lilienfeld, 1994; Skeem & Cooke, in press).

These critiques of the PCL-R are uniquely relevant to the recent explosion of interest in psychopathy. Recall that this interest is based largely on the relationship between PCL-R “psychopathy” and future violence. A closer look at this relationship indicates that the most violence predictive scales of the PCL-R do not capture psychopathy per se (emotional detachment), but instead represent past antisocial and irresponsible behavior (Skeem & Mulvey, 2001; Skeem, Grisso & Mulvey, 2003; Walters, 2003). This contradicts common sense and academic notions that psychopathic individuals’ core traits are directly linked with violence. One might assume that psychopathic individuals are violent because they lack the higher human emotions (e.g., remorse, guilt, empathy) that would typically inhibit violent behavior (Hart, 1998). However there is little evidence to support this assumption (Skeem & Mulvey, 2001; Skeem et al., 2003).

Questions have arisen not only about the nature of the relationship between PCL-R “psychopathy” and violence, but also about the homogeneity of individuals identified as psychopathic by the PCL-R (Skeem, Poythress, Edens, Lilienfeld, & Cale, 2003). Recent research suggests that these ostensibly similar individuals differ systematically in their basic personality dimensions (e.g., degree of anxiety) and in their propensities toward, and motivation for, violent behavior (Patrick & Zempolich, 1998; Skeem et al., 2003; Hart & Dempster, 1997).

Recent criticisms of the PCL-R and questions about the homogeneity of PCL-R psychopathy suggest that it is time to develop a more nuanced view of the relation between PCL-R psychopathy and violence. Like PCL-R psychopathy, violence is not a

uniform entity. Instead, violence is the product of diverse patterns of motivation (Buss, 1961; Dodge, 1991). Different dimensions of psychopathy (and different types of psychopathic individuals) are likely to have unique relationships with particular types of violence. Examinations of the simple relationship between the PCL-R and violence obscure our understanding of how the core features of psychopathy (and related personality constructs) influence particular types of violent behavior.

The proposed thesis departs from past work on the relation between PCL-R psychopathy and violence by taking a more textured view of each variable. Although there is an empirical link between PCL measures of “psychopathy” and violence (Hemphill, Hare, & Wong, 1998; Salekin, Rogers, & Sewell 1996), research suggests that this link is primarily due to the fact that the PCL-R captures traits of impulsivity and hostility (Skeem & Mulvey, 2001; Skeem et al., 2003). However, traits of impulsivity and hostility are not representative of the core traits of psychopathy, such as shallow affect and lack of anxiety. Little research has attempted to disaggregate these two constructs and examine the unique relationship between the core traits of psychopathy and violence. Further, existing research on psychopathy and violence is based on individuals who differ systematically from one another. Therefore, the goals of this thesis are to (1) clarify the nature of the relationship between psychopathy and violence, (2) examine the interpersonal and affective aspects of PCL-R psychopathy and their relation to different patterns of motivation for violence, and (3) examine homogeneous subgroups of psychopathic individuals and their propensity and motivation for violence.

These issues are not simply those of academic debate. As noted earlier, the PCL-R is the most commonly used tool for assessing violence risk (Tolman & Mullendore, 2003).

It is often used in forensic assessments that inform legal decisions that include capital sentencing, general sentencing, institutional management, and civil commitment decisions (Cooke, Michie, & Ryan, 2001; Edens, Petrila, & Buffington-Vollum, 2001; Fitch & Ortega, 2000; Hart, 2001; Lyon & Ogloff, 2000). As such, the use of the PCL-R in the context of violence risk assessment has serious legal implications (e.g., longer prison sentences, death) for offenders and ethical implications for forensic psychologists. Clinical and legal practitioners may assume that a PCL-R score, linked with a prediction that an individual will be violent, means that the individual is emotionally detached, predatory, and inherently dangerous. However, this assumption may be inappropriate, given that the most violence predictive scales of the PCL-R do not capture psychopathy *per se*. Moreover, practitioners may assume that a “psychopath is a psychopath is a psychopath.” In fact, there are systematic differences among individuals diagnosed as psychopathic by the PCL-R, and these differences relate to risk for violence (Brinkley et al., 2004; Hicks et al., 2004; Rogers, 1995). In short, a blanket view of the relation between the PCL-R and violence could lead to inaccurate and uninformed clinical and legal decisions.

This literature review is presented in four sections. The first section focuses on the nature of psychopathy, given concerns that the modern PCL-R operationalization does not represent classic and clinical conceptions of psychopathy. The second section reviews research findings that the most violence predictive PCL-R scales do not capture psychopathy *per se*, but instead represent past antisocial behavior and impulsive hostility. This research challenges the common notion that the core traits of psychopathy lead to violent behavior, but fails to consider the heterogeneity of both psychopathy and

violence. The third section presents a more refined view of both psychopathy and violence as a means for more clearly understanding how psychopathy influences violent behavior. The fourth section presents the specific goals of the current research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Understanding Psychopathy

Psychopathy is a personality disorder that has received considerable attention over the past decade, chiefly because of its empirical association with criminality and violence. Of the theorists that have contributed to the psychopathy literature, Hervey Cleckley and Robert Hare have had the most significant impact on the current understanding of the construct of psychopathy. In this section I review Cleckley's original conception of psychopathy, and then discuss current conceptualizations, including Hare's work on psychopathic personality disorder and the related DSM diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder.

Classic Cleckleyan Psychopathy

Hervey Cleckley's *The Mask of Sanity* (1941) is a seminal and comprehensive discussion of psychopathy. Cleckley's description of this disorder is based on the observation and case study of individuals at a psychiatric institution. The Cleckleyan psychopath is characterized by a number of personality traits including egocentricity, callousness, and lack of anxiety (see Table 1 for a comprehensive list of Cleckleyan traits).

Table 1
Cleckley's (1941) Criteria for Psychopathic Personality Disorder

Characteristic	Description
1.	Superficial charm and good intelligence
2.	Absence of delusions and other signs of irrational thinking
3.	Absence of nervousness or psychoneurotic manifestations
4.	Unreliability
5.	Untruthfulness and insincerity
6.	Lack of remorse or shame
7.	Inadequately motivated antisocial behavior
8.	Poor judgment and failure to learn by experience
9.	Pathologic egocentricity and incapacity for love
10.	General poverty in major affective reactions
11.	Specific loss of insight
12.	Unresponsiveness in general interpersonal relations
13.	Fantastic and uninviting behavior with drink and without
14.	Suicide rarely carried out
15.	Sex life impersonal, trivial and poorly integrated
16.	Failure to follow any life plan

In addition to providing a detailed description of the characteristics of psychopathy, Cleckley (1982) provided hypotheses regarding the causal mechanism of the psychopathic personality. He believed that psychopaths were characterized by a central emotional defect that left them unable to experience core human emotions, such as despair and guilt, or to understand the emotions of others. According to Cleckley (1948) the psychopath "...is usually free from anxiety, feelings of insecurity and all other manifestations of psychoneurosis" (p. 257). This core emotional defect resulted in low inhibition, and left little to stop psychopaths from engaging in self-serving and self-destructive behavior:

Callous to a remarkable degree about the effect of their conduct on others, whether in terms of physical pain, shame, disgrace or financial hardship, and little less restrained by losses and punishments to themselves, it is difficult to account for the fact that

these people do not more often commit major crimes that would bring about their permanent removal from the social group. (Cleckley, 1948, p. 258)

Although Cleckley noted that psychopathic individuals were *capable* of engaging in serious criminal behavior, he believed that psychopathic individuals could be differentiated from the common criminal on several levels. First, whereas a criminal works consistently to reach a desired end or a more powerful position, “[t]he psychopath very seldom takes much advantage of what he gains and almost never works consistently in crime or in anything else...” (Cleckley, 1982, p. 149). For example, a psychopath may engage in fraudulent activities for which he¹ certainly will be caught and unable to utilize his gains, whereas a criminal will take steps to avoid detection.

Second, the criminal is working toward a clear and understandable goal, but the psychopath’s actions have no clear purpose. According to Cleckley (1982), the common criminal works toward the same goals—money, power, success—that others work toward in a socially acceptable way, whereas the psychopath commits “inadequately motivated antisocial behavior”. In short, psychopaths may commit criminal deeds for little or no gain, even when the risk of being caught is large. Third, although both the psychopath and the criminal behave in ways that hurt others, the criminal takes steps to prevent self-harm, whereas the psychopath fails to do so. As Cleckley (1982) notes, the psychopaths’ “...most serious damage to others is often largely through their concern for him and their efforts to help him” (p. 150).

Finally Cleckley believed that the psychopath was much less likely to commit serious violent crimes:

¹ Psychopaths are commonly referred to with masculine pronouns throughout the psychopathy literature; thus this practice will be used here.

The typical psychopath as I have seen him, usually does not commit murder or other offenses that promptly lead to major prison sentences....Of course I am aware of the fact that many persons showing the characteristics of those here described do commit major crimes and sometimes crimes of maximal violence. There are so many, however, who do not, that such tendencies should be regarded as the exception rather than as the rule... (Cleckley, 1982, p. 150).

Cleckley (1982) also suggested that violence committed by the typical psychopath was characterized by a lack of emotion or passion and was more of a casual act done on impulse:

It is my opinion that when the typical psychopath, in the sense with which this term is here used, occasionally commits a major deed of violence, it is usually a casual act done not from tremendous passion or as a result of plans persistently followed with earnest compelling fervor. There is less to indicate excessively violent rage than a relatively weak emotion breaking through even weaker restraints. The psychopath is not volcanically explosive, at the mercy of irresistible drives and overwhelming rages of temper. Often he seems scarcely wholehearted, even in wrath or wickedness. (p. 150)

In summary, Cleckleyan psychopathy consists of a constellation of personality traits that revolve around emotional detachment. Cleckley differentiated psychopathic individuals from criminals, viewing criminality as secondary to such interpersonal and affective features as shallow affect and an inability to form close attachments. Cleckley's view of psychopathy and violence particularly stands in stark contrast to current conceptions of psychopathy and violence, as represented by Robert Hare: "...it is

primarily the violence of psychopaths that captures the headlines, particularly when it ends in an apparently senseless death” (1996, p. 38). Hare (1996) also describes psychopathic individuals as “...intraspecies predators who use charm, manipulation, intimidation, and violence to control others and to satisfy their selfish needs” (p. 26).

Hare's Modern Operationalization of Psychopathy

Although classic Cleckleyan psychopathy has significantly impacted clinical conceptions of psychopathic personality deviation, the field has come to equate psychopathy with Hare's measure of the disorder. In part, this may be because most of the interest in psychopathy is driven by the empirical connection between this measure and violence (Skeem & Cooke, in press). Hare's operationalization of psychopathy (the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised; PCL-R; Hare, 1991, 2003) is ostensibly based on Cleckley's seminal theory and will be described in detail next.

The Psychopathy Checklist Revised

The PCL-R (Hare, 1980, 1991, 2003) is a 20-item clinical rating scale that was developed with samples of offenders (see Table 2). Trained clinicians make ratings on the PCL-R with information gleaned from a semi-structured interview and a review of institutional records. In addition, variants of this measure have since been developed for forensic and psychiatric patients (PCL:SV, Hart, Cox, & Hare, 1995) and juvenile offenders (PCL:YV, Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003). Most of the modern empirical literature on psychopathy is based on the PCL-R and its offspring.

Table 2
PCL-R Criteria for Psychopathic Personality Disorder

Item	Description
1.	Glibness/superficial charm
2.	Grandiose sense of self-worth
3.	Need for stimulation/proneness to boredom
4.	Pathological lying
5.	Conning/manipulative
6.	Lack of remorse or guilt
7.	Shallow affect
8.	Callous/lack of empathy
9.	Parasitic lifestyle
10.	Poor behavioral controls
11.	Promiscuous sexual behavior
12.	Early behavioral problems
13.	Lack of realistic, long-term goals
14.	Impulsivity
15.	Irresponsibility
16.	Failure to accept responsibility for own actions
17.	Many short-term marital relationships
18.	Juvenile delinquency
19.	Revocation of conditional release
20.	Criminal versatility

Note. PCL-R = Psychopathy Checklist Revised (Hare, 1991, 2003).

Early exploratory factor analyses of the PCL-R yielded a two-factor structure (see Table 3 for the traditional two-factor model, Hare, 1991; Hare, Harpur, Hakistan, Forth, Hart et al., 1990; Harpur, Hakstian, & Hare, 1988; Harpur, Hare, & Hakistan, 1989). Although several structural factor models for the PCL-R have since been proposed, this two-factor model is the best known and has come to dominate the psychopathy literature. The first factor in this model measures the “selfish, callous, and remorseless use of others” (Hare et al., 1990) or the interpersonal and affective traits of psychopathy. The second factor captures the “chronically unstable, antisocial, and socially deviant lifestyle” (Hare et al., 1990) or the impulsive and criminal behaviors often associated with

psychopathy (Hare, 1991). The first factor will be referred to as “emotional detachment”, whereas the second factor will be referred to as “antisocial behavior” for the remainder of this document (Skeem et al., 2003).

Table 3
Traditional Two-Factor Model of PCL-R Psychopathy

Factor 1: Emotional Detachment	Factor 2: Antisocial Behavior
1. Glibness/superficial charm	3. Need for stimulation/proneness to boredom
2. Grandiose sense of self-worth	9. Parasitic lifestyle
4. Pathological lying	10. Poor behavioral controls
5. Conning/manipulative	12. Early behavioral problems
6. Lack of remorse or guilt	13. Lack of realistic, long-term goals
7. Shallow affect	14. Impulsivity
8. Callous/lack of empathy	15. Irresponsibility
16. Failure to accept responsibility for own actions	18. Juvenile delinquency
	19. Revocation of conditional release

Note. PCL-R = Psychopathy Checklist Revised (Hare, 1991, 2003). There are three PCL-R items that do not load on either factor: item 11, Promiscuous sexual behavior; item 17, Many short-term marital relationships; item 20, Criminal versatility.

Although these two factors are correlated ($r \approx .50$), according to Hare (1991, 2003; Hare, Hart & Harpur, 1990) they measure two different aspects of psychopathy (Hare et al., 1990; Hare, 1991). Research suggests that the emotional detachment and antisocial behavior factors have divergent relationships with such external correlates as violence, criminality, and neurological deficits (Lilienfeld, 1998). These divergent relationships have led several investigators to assert that these two PCL-R factors measure two different *constructs* (psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder), rather than two different aspects of psychopathy. For example, the emotional detachment factor is associated with deficits in processing emotional words (Williamson, Harpur, & Hare, 1991), reduced startle response to aversive stimuli (Patrick, Bradley, & Lang, 1993) and reduced fear response compared to controls (Lykken, 1995; Newman & Schmitt, 1998).

In contrast, the antisocial behavior factor is highly associated with criminality (Hare et al., 1990; Harpur et al., 1989). In addition, the emotional detachment factor is highly related ($r = .80$) to clinicians' global ratings of Cleckeyan psychopathy (Hare, 1991), whereas the antisocial behavior factor is highly related to the DSM diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder (ASPD; Hare, 1991).

The notion that these two “psychopathy” factors measure two different constructs has been the cause of considerable debate. Although the PCL-R measure includes the antisocial behavior factor, a long line of researchers have argued that past antisocial behavior is not an essential feature of psychopathy. This debate began with the DSM-IV field trial for ASPD.

DSM Field Trials

Prior to the development of the PCL-R, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III-R; American Psychiatric Association, 1987) diagnosis of ASPD was the only formally recognized disorder that approximated psychopathy. However, scholars criticized these criteria for excluding personality features believed to be central to psychopathy and including features that were not specific or essential to the construct (Hare, 1980; Lilienfeld, 1994; Millon, 1981; Rogers, & Dion, 1991; Wulach, 1983). According to Hare, Hart, and Harpur (1991), the DSM-III criteria were problematic in two respects. First, the DSM-III criteria were both underinclusive and overinclusive because of their emphasis on antisocial behavior. Specifically, the criteria for ASPD (a) did not include the core traits of emotional detachment, so people with these traits were excluded from a diagnosis of ASPD if they avoided chronic antisocial behavior (Hare et al., 1991; see also Lilienfeld, 1994, 1998), and (b) consisted chiefly of

antisocial behavior, so a diverse group of chronic offenders were included in the heterogeneous, “ASPD” group. Second, the authors believed the ASPD criteria represented a “rather radical break with clinical tradition” (p. 392, Hare et al., 1991) given that the ASPD criteria did not include core traits of emotional detachment (Cleckley, 1941).

To address this debate and inform proposed revisions to the ASPD criteria for the DSM-IV, a field trial was conducted (Widiger, Cadoret, Hare, Robins, Rutherford et al., 1996). Although the trial resulted in a simplified set of criteria for ASPD, the diagnosis still differs substantially from traditional conceptions of psychopathy. According to the ASPD work group, the traditional psychopathic traits were not added because the results of the field trial were mixed with regard to reliability, differential diagnosis, external correlates, and incremental validity of the traits (Widiger et al., 1996; For a list of DSM criteria see Table 4). Currently, ASPD is operationalized by the DSM-IV criteria, whereas psychopathy is operationalized most often by the PCL-R².

² About 80% of offenders meet criteria for ASPD whereas only 25% meet criteria for PCL-R psychopathy. Almost all individuals who are diagnosed with PCL-R psychopathy also meet criteria for ASPD (Hare, 1989; Lilienfeld, 1994).

Table 4
DSM-IV-TR Criteria for Antisocial Personality Disorder

a.	Pervasive pattern of disregard for and violation of the rights of others since age 15, indicated by three (or more) of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failure to conform to social norms with respect to lawful behaviors as indicated by repeatedly performing acts that are grounds for arrest 2. Deceitfulness, indicated by repeated lying, use of aliases, or conning others for personal profit or pleasure 3. Impulsivity or failure to plan ahead 4. Irritability and aggressiveness, indicated by repeated physical fights or assaults 5. Reckless disregard for safety of self and others 6. Consistent irresponsibility, indicated by repeated failures to sustain consistent work behavior or honor financial obligations 7. Lack of remorse, indicated by being indifferent to or rationalizing having hurt, mistreated, or stolen from another
b.	At least 18 years of age
c.	Evidence of conduct disorder before the age of 15
d.	Does not occur exclusively during the course of schizophrenia or a manic episode

Note. Taken from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th ed.; DSM-IV-TR; American Psychiatric Association, 2000, pp. 701-706).

Thus, a long line of researchers have argued that antisocial behavior is not an essential or core feature of psychopathy (Cleckley, 1941; Cooke & Michie, 2001; Cooke et al., 2004; Lilienfeld, 1994, 1998; McCord & McCord, 1964; Rogers, 1995; Skeem & Cooke, in press). Although Hare (1980; Hare et al., 1991) heavily criticized the DSM and argued that psychopathy should not be confused with ASPD, Hare and Neumann (2005) have recently asserted that antisocial behavior is a central feature of psychopathy. The issues raised in this debate are outline below given that they are crucial to understanding the overall construct of psychopathy.

Is Antisocial Behavior a Component of Psychopathy?

For many years, the PCL-R's two-factor model of psychopathy as correlated dimensions of emotional detachment and antisocial behavior was widely accepted. Recently, however, both the measure and its underlying model have been criticized

(Cooke & Michie, 1997; Cooke & Michie, 2001; Cooke et al., 2004; Cooke, Michie, & Hart, 2006; Cooke, Michie, & Skeem, in press; Lilienfeld, 1994; Skeem, & Cooke, in press). Although alternative models that exclude antisocial behavior have been proposed (Cooke, & Michie, 2001) Hare and his colleagues, in an apparent position reversal, now assert that antisocial behavior is “central” to the “comprehensive assessment of psychopathy” (Hare & Neumann, 2005; Hill, Neumann, & Rogers, 2004; Vitacco, Rogers, Neumann, Harrison, & Vincent, 2005). This “factor debate” echoes the earlier debate regarding the DSM-IV criteria for ASPD.

The Factor Debate

Competing views about whether antisocial behavior “belongs” to psychopathy are associated with corresponding structural models of the PCL-R. Because these models have direct implications for conceptualizations of psychopathy and (consequently) empirical relations among components of psychopathy and types of violence, they will be detailed here.

Cooke and Michie’s Three-Factor Model. According to Cooke and Michie (2001) the original two-factor model rested on support that relied on out-dated analytic techniques (e.g., congruence coefficients). The two-factor model had never been statistically compared with competing models. Using item response theory (IRT) and confirmatory factor analyses (CFA), Cooke and Michie (2001) developed a hierarchical three-factor model that reflected the traditional interpersonal, affective, and lifestyle features of psychopathy. The three-factor model was developed on a larger PCL-R dataset and was cross-validated in North American ($n = 2,067$) and Scottish ($n = 596$) samples with both forensic psychiatric and correctional populations (Cooke & Michie, 2001).

The three-factor model differs from the two-factor model in two ways. First, the emotional detachment factor was divided into separate interpersonal (“Arrogant and Deceitful Interpersonal Style”) and affective (“Deficient Affective Experience”) factors. Second, half of the items (poor behavioral controls, promiscuous sexual behavior, early behavior problems, many short-term marital relationships, juvenile delinquency, revocation of conditional release, and criminal versatility) from the original antisocial behavior factor were deleted because (a) seminal descriptions of psychopathy did not include antisocial behavior, (b) the inclusion of antisocial behavior might lead to an overdiagnosis of psychopathy and, (c) they were shown to be poor indicators of psychopathy (Cooke & Michie, 2001; Cooke et al., 2004). The latter point is consistent with previous research, which suggests that relative to the affective features of psychopathy, the deleted items are less precise indicators of the disorder and show less stability across different cultures and age groups (Bolt, Hare, Vitale, & Newman, 2004; Cooke, Kosson, & Michie, 2001; Cooke & Michie, 1997; Cooke, Michie, Hart, & Hare, 1999; Cooke, Michie, Hart, & Clark, 2005).

Thus, the three-factor model (see Table 5) poses that the superordinate factor of psychopathy has three underlying factors: Interpersonal (Factor 1), Affective (Factor 2), and Lifestyle (Factor 3) traits. The three-factor model has been cross validated with several diverse samples and has reliably been shown to provide a better fit with PCL data than the two-factor model (Cooke & Michie, 2001; Cooke et al., 2004; Cooke et al., in press; Skeem et al., 2003; Warren et al., 2003).

Table 5
Cooke and Michie's (2001) Three-Factor Model of PCL-R Psychopathy

Factor 1: Interpersonal	
1.	Glibness/superficial charm
2.	Grandiose sense of self-worth
4.	Pathological lying
5.	Conning/manipulative
Factor 2: Affective	
6.	Lack of remorse or guilt
7.	Shallow affect
8.	Callous/lack of empathy
16.	Failure to accept responsibility for own actions
Factor 3: Lifestyle	
3.	Need for stimulation/proneness to boredom
9.	Parasitic lifestyle
13.	Lack of realistic, long-term goals
14.	Impulsivity
15.	Irresponsibility

Note. PCL-R = Psychopathy Checklist Revised (Hare, 1991, 2003). There are seven antisocial items that are not included in this model: item 10, Poor behavioral controls; item 11, Promiscuous sexual behavior; item 12, Early behavioral problems; item 17, Many short-term marital relationships; item 18, Juvenile delinquency; item 19, Revocation of conditional release; item 20, Criminal versatility (Cooke & Michie, 2001).

Hare's Fourth Factor. According to Hare's recent arguments (Hare, 2003; Hare & Neumann, 2005), antisocial behavior is a core feature of psychopathy. Hare (2003) has developed a series of four-factor models, based on PCL-R analyses with over 9,000 participants in various studies. These models embrace all of the antisocial items that were "orphaned" by the three-factor model and add an additional item (criminal versatility) that was not included in the two-factor model. In essence, the four-factor models include Cooke and Michie's (2001) three factors (interpersonal, affective, & lifestyle) and add a fourth factor that resurrects criminality (see Table 6 for Hare's fourth

factor). No compelling theoretical rationale or empirical data have been presented in support of the four-factor model (see Hare & Neumann, 2005).

Table 6
Hare's Fourth Factor

Factor 4: Criminality

-
- 10. Poor behavioral controls
 - 12. Early behavioral problems
 - 18. Juvenile delinquency
 - 19. Revocation of conditional release
 - 20. Criminal versatility
-

Note. Hare's four-factor model includes Cooke & Michie's three factors, plus an additional fourth factor (Hare, 2003).

The Statistical Debate. The development of the three-and four-factor models has spurred research that seeks to determine which model is statistically superior. Although both the three- and four-factor models of PCL-R psychopathy have been replicated with adult samples, only two studies with sufficient statistical power have compared the relative fit of the three- and four-factor models. In one study, Vitacco, Neumann, and Jackson (2005) found that both models provided good fit in a sub-sample of civil psychiatric patients ($n = 840$) from the MacArthur Violence Risk Assessment Study. In the second study, Cooke et al. (in press) compared the fit of the three-factor and four-factor models with a sample of 1,212 male offenders and found that even a degraded version of the three-factor model outperformed the four-factor model. These authors provided the covariance matrix and models for specifying the models to make the analyses as transparent as possible.

Despite the fact that the statistical debate continues (see Cooke et al., in press), several researchers, as outlined below, have argued that the three-factor model is more consistent with theory and personality-based approaches to the assessment of psychopathy (Cooke et al., 2004; Lilienfeld, 1994, 1998; Skeem & Cooke, in press).

Theoretical and Research Considerations. Despite these arguments about the structure and validity of the PCL-R, many have come to equate the PCL-R and the two-factor model with a theory of psychopathy. This may be problematic because "...the PCL-R deviates significantly from its own theoretical underpinnings..." (Rogers, 1995, p. 232), by including non-specific indices of antisocial behavior as fundamental to the construct. Although the PCL-R is ostensibly based on Cleckleyan psychopathy (Hare, 1980; Hare, 1991, 2003), only 1/3 of the items are representative of Cleckley's original criteria (Rogers, 1995), indicating that a small portion of the PCL-R is based on Cleckley's seminal theory.

Equating the PCL-R with psychopathy may distort our understanding of psychopathic personality deviation. First, like the ASPD criteria, the PCL-R criteria may be both underinclusive and overinclusive in diagnosing psychopathy (Cooke et al., 2004; Lilienfeld, 1994, 1998; Skeem, & Mulvey, 2001). Use of the PCL-R to identify psychopathy (a) might miss the emotionally detached individuals we wish to study and (b) might identify a heterogeneous group of individuals who share criminality but vary in their basic personality dimensions (Lilienfeld, 1994). With respect to the latter point, simple "counts" of past antisocial behavior cannot capture subtle personality differences that may result in differing motivation for behavior. For example, one individual may rob a store because he is poor and needs food, whereas a psychopathic individual may rob

a store not because he needs money, but for purposes a reasonable person could not understand, which might reflect selfishness and lack of conscience.

Second, the inclusion of criminal behavior in the PCL-R interferes with our understanding of how the core traits of psychopathy relate to criminal and violent behavior (Cooke et al., 2004; Skeem & Cooke, in press). Because the PCL-R is saturated with indices of criminality, and past behavior predicts like future behavior, the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and violence may have little to do with psychopathy per se (Cooke et al., 2004; Lilienfeld, 1994; Skeem & Cooke, in press; Skeem et al., 2003; Skeem & Mulvey, 2001). Several theorists have construed antisocial behavior and violence as a consequence of the interpersonal and affective characteristics of psychopathy (Cooke et al., 2004) but use of the PCL-R makes this hypothesis difficult to study. As noted by Hare (1999): “*Because* they are emotionally unconnected to the rest of humanity, and *because* they callously view others as little more than objects, it should be relatively easy for psychopaths to victimize the vulnerable and to use violence as a tool to obtain what they want” (emphasis added, p. 185; see also Cooke et al., 2004; Hart, 1998). As Cooke et al. (in press) note: “Failure to disaggregate the measurement of these two constructs renders it impossible to argue persuasively that psychopathic personality disorder *produces* criminal behaviour” (p. 3).

In contrast, several researchers (Hare & Neumann, 2005; Vitacco et al., 2005; Vitacco et al., 2005) have argued that including antisocial behavior increases the utility of the PCL-R in predicting violence and criminality. Thus, they suggest that the four-factor model must be a more valid representation of psychopathy. Of course, adding other

items (e.g., age, neighborhood disadvantage) would undoubtedly increase the predictive utility of the PCL-R; this has little to do with enhancing its assessment of psychopathy.

In short, this debate about the factor structure of the PCL-R has direct implications for understanding the construct of psychopathy and its relationship to violence. The issue of whether antisocial behavior “belongs” to psychopathy raises important issues about the substantial body of research on psychopathy and violence that is based on the PCL-R. Several researchers have found that PCL-R scores predict violence chiefly by tapping antisocial behavior, impulsivity, and hostility (Skeem & Mulvey, 2001; Walters, 2003). Until research goes beyond the simple examination of the PCL-R’s utility in predicting future violence to investigate which components of psychopathy are related to particular types of violence, we will have only a partial understanding of this issue.

The Empirical Association Between Psychopathy and Violence

These conceptualizations of psychopathy and critiques of the PCL-R’s ability to adequately capture the construct contextualize a large body of research on the relation between psychopathy and violence. In this section, I summarize research on the basic link between the PCL-R and violence, before examining this relationship more closely by extracting the core traits of PCL-R psychopathy (emotional detachment) from the impulsive and antisocial tendencies that it also captures.

The Basics: PCL-R Psychopathy and Violence

PCL-R psychopathy is currently touted as the leading single predictor³ of future violence (Hart, 1998; Hare, 1999; Hare, Clark, Grann, & Thornton, 2000; Hemphill et al., 1998; Salekin et al., 1996; Walters, 2003) and has become the most commonly used tool for violence risk assessment (Tolman & Mullendore, 2005). A multitude of original studies, meta-analyses and reviews have established a link between PCL-R psychopathy and violence in offender and psychiatric samples (e.g., Hemphill et al., 1998; Salekin et al., 1996; for a review see Walters, 2003). This research indicates that PCL-R psychopathy is related to a higher frequency of violent behavior (Forth, Hart & Hare, 1990; Haapasalo, 1994; Hare, 1981; Hare & Jutai, 1983; Hare & McPherson, 1984; Holland, Beckett, & Levi, 1981; Serin 1991; Williamson, Hare, & Wong, 1987). Specifically, compared to non-psychopaths, PCL-R psychopaths are more likely to have been convicted of a violent crime (Forth et al. 1990; Haapasalo, 1994; Hare 1981; Hare & McPherson, 1984), to have committed a higher number of violent crimes (Forth et al. 1990; Haapasalo, 1994; Holland et al., 1981; Serin, 1991), and have higher violent recidivism rates (Harris, Rice, & Cormier, 1991; Serin, 1996; Serin & Amos, 1995; Rice, Harris, & Quinsey, 1990). Research also indicates that higher PCL-R scores are associated with more serious and rare forms of violence (with the exception of murder; Hare & McPherson, 1984; Williamson et al., 1987). Specifically, higher PCL-R scores are associated with use of a weapon (Hare & Jutai, 1983; Hare & McPherson, 1984;

³ There are many other variables that predict future violence, for example demographic variables, criminal history, and substance abuse predict future violence (Monahan et al., 2001). The PCL-R alone is comparable to, or better than these variables and actuarial scales designed to predict violence, such as the HCR-20 (Webster, Douglas, Eaves, & Hart, 1997).

Serin, 1991), violence committed for material gain (Williamson et al. 1987), and violence against strangers (Hare & McPherson, 1984; Williamson et al., 1987).

For example, Hare & McPherson (1984) conducted a prototypical study of psychopathy and violence with a sample of 227 male inmates. Inmates were classified as psychopathic, mixed, and non-psychopathic based on cut-off scores on an early version of the PCL-R. Violence was assessed using information contained in institutional files and interview transcripts. This study indicated that psychopaths were more likely to have a violent conviction compared to the two other groups, and that psychopaths were more likely to use a weapon. They also found that PCL-R classifications accurately predicted violent group membership for 76.2% of the participants (Hare & McPherson, 1984).

In addition, several meta-analyses have been conducted to examine the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and violence and have yielded consistent results. For example, Salekin, Rogers, and Sewell (1996) conducted a meta-analysis of research on PCL-R psychopathy and violence consisting of 18 studies and found that psychopathy had a correlation of .26 with violent recidivism. They noted that: “Despite its limitations, the PCL-R appears to be unparalleled as a measure for making risk assessments with white male inmates” (Salekin et al., 1996, p. 211, cites omitted). Hemphill et al. (1998) also conducted a meta-analysis and found that overall psychopathy scores in seven studies correlated .21-.27 with violent recidivism.

Although the PCL-R’s correlation with violence seems modest, it competes with those of tools explicitly designed to assess risk for violence (Hart, 1998; Hemphill et al., 1998). One researcher notes: “...the accuracy of violence predictions using the PCL-R is only slightly lower than the accuracy of predictions that CBT will reduce the symptoms

of depression, psychotherapy will improve general well-being, or cardiac bypass surgery will reduce angina pain” (Hart, 1998, p. 132). In addition, a measure of PCL psychopathy was the leading predictor of violence in a pool of 134 violence risk factors included in the MacArthur Violence Risk Assessment Study, the largest study of violence risk assessment ever conducted (Monahan, Steadman, Silver, Appelbaum, Robbins, Mulvey, Roth, Grisso, & Banks, 2001; see also Skeem & Mulvey, 2001).

In sum, PCL-R psychopathy has become known as a “mini-theory” of violence (Hart, 1998) where psychopathic individuals (as assessed by the PCL-R) are believed to be inherently violent. This is in direct opposition to seminal descriptions of the disorder where violent behavior was considered rare or exceptional (Cleckley, 1941). Given that PCL-R psychopathy currently plays a large role in violence risk assessment, it is essential to demonstrate that the core interpersonal and affective traits of psychopathy lead to an increased risk for violence. However, the concerns outlined above suggest that the PCL-R measure confounds psychopathy with antisocial behavior, impulsivity and hostility. Thus, research that more closely examines the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and violence is crucial to understanding the role of the interpersonal and affective features of the PCL-R in violence risk assessment.

A Closer Look: PCL-R Dimensions and Violence

Despite strong empirical support for the utility of the PCL-R in predicting violence, some researchers have suggested that the measure’s assessment of “standard static offender risk” factors largely accounts for this utility (Gendreau et al., 2002, p. 401). As noted earlier, some have found that the most violence predictive scales of the PCL-R do not capture “psychopathy”, but instead represent traits of hostility and impulsivity that

may underlie antisocial behavior (Skeem & Mulvey, 2001; Skeem et al., 2003). In this section, the simple bivariate relationship between the PCL-R factors and violence will be reviewed, followed by an analysis of the *unique* relationship between these factors (particularly emotional detachment) and violence.

The Basics: PCL-R Dimensions and Violence

Although some psychopathy researchers assert that emotional detachment items are just as important to violence risk assessment as antisocial behavior items (Hemphill & Hare, 2004) there is little data to support this claim. For example, Hare and McPherson (1984) classified inmates into violent and non-violent groups and conducted a discriminant function analysis to determine how accurately each PCL-R item would discriminate between violent and non-violent inmates. They found that the most highly discriminating PCL-R items were those that captured impulsivity and a history of antisocial behavior. This finding is consistent with extant research, which generally shows that the emotional detachment factor has a weaker association with violence ($r < .20$) than the antisocial behavior factor (r greater than or equal to $.30$; Salekin et al., 1996; Skeem & Mulvey, 2001).

Salekin et al. (1996) conducted the first large meta-analytic review of psychopathy and violence research, which provides preliminary evidence that the antisocial behavior factor is a better predictor of future violence than the emotional detachment factor. Salekin et al. (1996) reported that the effect size for the antisocial behavior factor (.73) was significantly higher than the effect size for the emotional detachment factor (.42) and concluded that “psychologists may want to be more cautious in making predictive statements when scores are predominately composed of F1 [emotional detachment] items

until further research elucidates the relationship between the PCL factors and recidivism more clearly” (Salekin et al., 1996, p. 212). However, out of the 18 prediction studies included in this review, only one study of sexual violence (Barbaree, Seto, Serin, Amos, & Preston, 1994) included means and standard deviations for the PCL factor scores. Thus, this conclusion is limited given that the factor-based analyses used only a single sample.

In 1998, Hemphill et al. conducted another meta-analytic review that compared the PCL factors in terms of their ability to predict future violence. In this case, only three of the studies that examined violent recidivism (Heilbrun, Hart, Hare, Gustafson, Nunez, & White, 1998; Hemphill, 1992; Serin, 1996) had factor scores available. The authors (Hemphill et al., 1998) statistically compared the correlations between both factors and violence and found that neither factor was significantly more strongly correlated with violent recidivism. However, the correlations in two out of the three studies were low for the emotional detachment factor (.05 & .09).

In a more comprehensive and rigorous study, Walters (2003) meta-analyzed 42 studies that resulted in a total of 50 effect sizes, all of which included factor scores. This study was specifically designed to assess the relative predictive validity of the two PCL factors. Only studies with prospective designs were chosen for inclusion in the analysis. The results of this meta-analysis clearly suggest that the antisocial behavior factor surpasses the emotional detachment factor in the prediction of violent recidivism and violent institutional behavior. For violent recidivism, the weighted correlation of 27 studies was lower for the emotional detachment factor ($r_w = .18$) than for antisocial behavior ($r_w = .26$). Similarly, for violent institutional behavior, a total of 14 studies

indicate that the antisocial behavior factor ($r_w = .22$) was more strongly related than the emotional detachment factor ($r_w = .12$).

In sum, the weight of the evidence suggests that the PCL-R's emotional detachment factor plays a weaker role than its antisocial behavior factor in predicting violence. This evidence is consistent with the results of research presented below, which examines the unique contribution of the core traits of psychopathy to violence prediction.

Unique Relationships: PCL-R Dimensions and Violence

Although several studies report the size of the bivariate relationship between the psychopathy factors and violence, very little research has explicitly focused on examining the *unique* relationship of each factor with violence. Recall that the PCL-R factors are correlated at about .5 (Hare, 1991, 2003). Thus, research that examines only total PCL-R scores or fails to control for the correlation between the factors may miss important relationships because of statistical suppressor effects (Lilienfeld, 1994; Hicks, Markon, Patrick, Krueger, & Newman, 2004). Thus, research that controls for the shared variance between the PCL-R factors is central to understanding the contribution of the core traits of psychopathy to violence prediction.

Although the Walters (2003) meta-analysis discussed earlier is the largest, most comprehensive summary of research on psychopathy and violence to date, the reported effect sizes did not control for the variance shared by the two factors. Research that has examined the unique relation between the PCL-R factors and violence suggests that the antisocial behavior factor explains the "lion's share" of the variance in predicting future violence (Skeem et al., 2003; Skeem & Mulvey, 2001; Skeem et al., in press). In 2001, Skeem and Mulvey conducted a study to systematically evaluate whether the two factors

were equivalent in terms of violence risk. Their sample consisted of 1,136 civil psychiatric patients, who research assistants attempted to locate and interview in the community five times during the year after hospital discharge. Violence was assessed based on self-report and collateral reports, and was defined as assault that resulted in injury, threats with a weapon in hand, or sexual assault. The authors found that when the correlation between PCL-R factors was controlled, the association between emotional detachment and violence became weak (partial $r = .05$), whereas the correlation for the antisocial behavior factor remained moderate (partial $r = .26$).

The above findings seem to suggest that the relationship between the PCL-R and future violence is largely due to impulsivity and hostility (Skeem et al., 2003; Skeem & Mulvey, 2001). Although Skeem and Mulvey (2001) found that the emotional detachment factor was weakly related to future violence, other research contradicts this finding. For example, Serin (1996) used hierarchical regression to compare the relative utility of the two factors and found that only the emotional detachment factor contributed significantly to the prediction of violent recidivism in a sample of 81 prison inmates. Violence in this study was defined as re-arrest and conviction for robbery, assault, manslaughter, sexual assault, or murder and the average follow-up period was approximately 2.5 years. It is possible that these conflicting findings are due to the use of prison vs. civil psychiatric samples, different definitions and assessment methods of violence, different follow-up length, or random error. Like Skeem and Mulvey (2001), Serin (1996) failed to find a significant interaction between the PCL-R factors in violence prediction. This finding suggests that the unique combination of the psychopathy factors is unnecessary for maximal violence prediction. This research raises serious issues with

the use of the PCL-R measure as a tool for predicting violence risk, particularly since it is unclear which PCL-R features lead to a high risk for violence.

In addition, research that has examined the new three-factor model (Cooke & Michie, 2001) of PCL-R psychopathy indicates that the predictive utility of the PCL-R is reduced, but does not disappear, once items that capture antisocial behavior are removed. As noted earlier, the three-factor model divides the emotional detachment factor into two separate factors (interpersonal and affective factors) and removes PCL items that measure antisocial behavior and criminal history from the third factor (impulsivity). Using the same data set described above (Skeem & Mulvey, 2001), Skeem et al. (2003) evaluated Cooke and Michie's (2001) three-factor model with regard to violence prediction.

The authors found that three-factor model total scores were less predictive of violence than the traditional model. They also found that the impulsivity factor was less predictive of violence than the original antisocial behavior factor. Although overall the three-factor model was less predictive of violent behavior, with the antisocial PCL-R items removed, the correlations for the three factors and violence were almost equal (Interpersonal $r = .24$, Affective $r = .26$, Impulsivity $r = .25$). When the shared variance among each factor was controlled, the correlations decreased substantially but were still significant (interpersonal partial $r = .08$, affective partial $r = .09$, lifestyle partial $r = .12$; all $p > .05$), with the lifestyle factor accounting for most of the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and violence. Douglas, Strand, Belfrage, Fransson, and Levandee (2005) also evaluated the three-factor model and its relation to violence in a mixed forensic (psychiatric, offender, and evaluatees) sample. This study indicated that all three PCL-R factors were significantly predictive of violence. Specifically, the affective and lifestyle

factors had a positive association with violence and the interpersonal factor had a negative association with violence.

Thus, although it is assumed that the core traits of psychopathy lead to an increased propensity to commit violence, extant research on the relationship between the PCL-R dimensions and violence provides mixed evidence about the validity of this assumption. Specifically research suggests that the PCL-R represents: "...a consistent, reliable method for tapping a broad range of personality features (e.g., impulsivity, hostility). Although these features are not necessarily pathological, if found sufficiently pronounced in an individual, they put him or her at high risk for involvement in violent situations" (Skeem et al., 2005, p. 455). The weight of the current evidence indicates that the impulsive and antisocial features captured by the PCL-R are more strongly tied to violence than the interpersonal and affective traits of psychopathy. However, some evidence suggests that the emotional detachment aspects of psychopathy may play a role in violence risk (Douglas et al., 2005; Serin, 1996).

Clearly, more research is needed to clarify the role of the core psychopathic traits in violence risk assessment. It is clear that, of traits assessed by the PCL-R, those related to antisocial behavior (not psychopathy per se) predict the most common form of violence. However, there has been little focus on the nature of purported links between specific dimensions of psychopathy and particular motivations for violence. For example, the affective deficits of psychopathy (lack of empathy, guiltlessness, fearlessness) may lead to a failure to inhibit violent behavior. The interpersonal traits (egocentricity, grandiosity) might relate to a desire to dominate or humiliate others. Together, these interpersonal and affective traits may be particularly related to predatory violence. The

impulsive lifestyle of psychopathic individuals might lead to risky behavior that results in an increased propensity to act violently (Cooke et al., 2004; Hart, 1998), particularly in response to perceived provocation. In short, it may be that these different dimensions of psychopathy have *distinct* relationships with violence and other behaviors. Indeed, as will be reviewed below, there are theories about the existence of different variants of psychopathy with propensities toward different patterns of violent behavior.

Different Psychopathies, Different Violence?

The discussion thus far has centered on different dimensions of psychopathy and antisocial behavior, and how these relate to violence. The factors of PCL-R psychopathy uniquely relate to violence and other external factors (e.g., anxiety, impulsivity) in a manner suggesting that the PCL-R does not identify a homogenous group of psychopathic individuals (Harpur et al., 1989; Skeem et al., 2003). A growing body of evidence suggests that the PCL-R identifies different types of individuals that match longstanding theories about variants of psychopathy (Hicks et al., 2004; Skeem et al., 2003). Specifically, some individuals with high PCL-R scores appear emotionally detached, have low levels of distress, and are socially calculating and goal-directed, whereas other individuals are emotionally disturbed and impulsive (Hicks et al., 2004; Skeem et al., 2003).

These differences among variants of psychopathy may relate to particular patterns of violent behavior (Patrick & Zempolich, 1998; Poythress & Skeem, 2006; Skeem et al., 2003). Moreover, the sociological literature indicates that violence is not a uniform entity, but instead is the product of diverse patterns of motivation (Anderson & Bushman,

2002; Berkowitz, 1993; Bushman & Anderson, 2001; Buss, 1961; Dodge, 1991; Feshbach, 1964; Patrick & Zempolich, 1998). For example, typically violence is motivated by emotions such as anger or fear, whereas some violence is motivated by external rewards such as money or power (Patrick & Zempolich, 1998).

In this section I present a nuanced view of both psychopathy and violence as a means for more clearly understanding how psychopathy influences violent behavior. After presenting theory and research on subtypes of psychopathy, I discuss implications of these subtypes for particular forms of violence.

Subtypes of Psychopathy: Primary and Secondary

The notion that psychopathic personality disorder is a heterogeneous construct is not a recent idea; however, relatively little research has explored this issue. Theorists that were contemporaries of both Cleckley (Karpman, 1941, 1946, 1948a, 1948b, 1955) and Hare (Lykken, 1995; Porter, 1996) postulated that there were *primary* and *secondary* variants of psychopathy. According to seminal theory (Karpman, 1941, 1948b), the primary psychopath is characterized by a genetically based emotional *deficit*. The secondary psychopath, in contrast, is thought to suffer from an emotional *disturbance* originating from environmental influences. The main distinction between these psychopathic subtypes was not their behavior, but the etiological pathways that led to their behavior. Specifically, both types are believed to commit socially deviant acts, but their motivations for doing so are thought to be different. Karpman's seminal theory of psychopathy subtypes is presented here.⁴

⁴ Karpman was the first to propose a theory of psychopathy subtypes and his is the theory upon which other relevant (that is, relevant to understanding the relationship between psychopathy and violence) typologies are based (Skeem et al., 2003).

Karpman's Subtypes

According to Karpman (1941, 1948b), the term psychopathy is applied to two entirely different groups of individuals that can be differentiated only in terms of the etiology of, and motivation for, their behavior. Specifically, both primary and secondary psychopaths are characterized by antisocial and irresponsible behavior, apparent lack of affect, and failure to learn from past experience. However, the behavior of the secondary psychopath is driven by experience-based *neurosis* (anxiety underpinned by hostility), whereas that of the primary psychopath reflects a genetically based lack of conscience and the expression of unbridled selfish desires (Karpman, 1941, 1948b).

Intuitively, this distinction has important implications for understanding the violent behavior of psychopathic individuals. Karpman (1946) encourages us to look beyond simple behaviors (violence, crime) to consider the motivation for such behavior. For example, does an apparently psychopathic individual commit violence based on strong feelings of arousal – as would a secondary psychopath – or based on “...relatively weak emotion breaking through even weaker restraints” (Cleckley, 1982, p. 150) as one might see in a primary psychopath? If subtypes of psychopathy exist, examinations of the simple relationship between the PCL-R and violence will obscure our understanding of the relation between psychopathy and violent behavior (Patrick & Zempolich, 1998). Research reviewed below supports the notion that the ostensibly similar individuals identified as psychopathic by the PCL-R differ systematically in their basic personality dimensions.

Support for the Existence of Subtypes

Both theory and evidence suggest that trait anxiety is a key variable for distinguishing between primary and secondary psychopaths (Blackburn 1975, 1996; Blackburn & Coid, 1999; Brinkley et al., 2004; Newman & Brinkley, 1997; Newman et al., 2005; Schmitt & Newman, 1999). According to Cleckley's (1941) conceptualization, the (primary) psychopath is marked by a distinct lack of anxiety and suffers from "semantic aphasia": he "...knows the 'words' of emotion, but not the 'music'" (pg. 569, Herpertz & Henning Sass, 2000, cites omitted). This lack of emotional reactivity, he postulated, reduced the (primary) psychopaths' propensity for aggressive and hostile acts (Cleckley, 1941). Karpman (1941, 1948b) shared the view that (primary) psychopaths manifested an emotional *deficit*, but postulated that the secondary psychopath would be emotionally disturbed or neurotic.

There is some support for this notion. First, research generally indicates that the PCL-R emotional detachment factor has a negative or null association with emotional disturbances or negative affect (anxiety, hostility), whereas the antisocial behavior factor is positively associated with various aspects of negative affectivity (Frick, et al., 1999; Harpur et al., 1989; Patrick et al., 1993; Patrick, 1994, 1995; Verona, Patrick, & Joiner, 2001; Skeem et al., 2005). For example, Harpur et al. (1989) reported that the association between PCL-R psychopathy and anxiety was stable across different self-report measures of anxiety. In this study, trait anxiety was positively correlated with the antisocial behavior factor ($r = .18$) but negatively correlated with the emotional detachment factor ($r = -.20$).

Second, individuals with high PCL-R scores can be differentiated in their degree of anxiety in a manner that is theoretically consistent with primary and secondary subtypes (Kosson, Smith, & Newman, 1990). High anxious (secondary) and low anxious (primary) psychopaths have been found to differ with regard to emotional processing deficits. For example, Newman and colleagues (Newman & Schmitt, 1998; Newman, Patterson, Howland, & Nichols, 1990; Newman, Schmitt, & Voss, 1997; Newman, Wallace, Schmitt, & Arnett, 1997) have found that only low-anxious psychopaths (primary) exhibit response modulation deficits consistent with Newman's (1998) hypothesis which poses that primary psychopathy is the result of a deficit in response to reward and punishment cues.

Despite the notion that identifying homogenous groups of psychopaths may be useful, relatively little empirical research has directly focused on psychopathy subtypes (for a review, see Skeem et al., 2003). The most elegant study relevant to this thesis was conducted by Hicks et al. (2004). Using a model-based cluster analysis, these authors attempted to identify subtypes of PCL-R psychopaths by clustering prison inmates ($n = 96$) on general personality traits. The best fitting model contained two clusters of psychopathic individuals consistent with Karpman's (1941) subtypes. The first cluster of primary or "emotionally stable" psychopaths was characterized by emotional detachment, social dominance, low negative emotionality, high positive affect, and low levels of trait anxiety. The second cluster of secondary or "aggressive" psychopaths was characterized by aggression, a lack of close relationships, low impulse control, and high levels of trait anxiety. Relative to emotionally stable psychopaths, aggressive psychopaths were involved in more fights, had a longer criminal history, more substance abuse problems

and were more anxious than the emotionally stable group (Hicks et al., 2004). Although the clusters did not differ in their PCL-R total or emotional detachment factor scores, aggressive psychopaths scored higher on the antisocial behavior factor (Hicks et al., 2004).

There is recent research that is consistent with the psychopathy subtypes identified in this study. Specifically, Skeem, Johansson, Andershed, Kerr, and Eno Louden (in press) identified primary and secondary psychopathy subtypes, similar to those identified by Hicks et al. (2004), by clustering violent prison inmates ($n = 124$) on PCL-R factor scores and trait anxiety.

In summary, research suggests that PCL-R psychopathy is not a uniform entity (Hicks et al., 2004; Patrick & Zempolich, 1998; Skeem et al., 2003; Skeem et al., in press). In particular, anxiety may be a key variable for distinguishing between these variants and their violent behavior. As Karpman (1946) suggests, the behavior of secondary psychopaths reflects "...some obscure neurotic urge (such as deep hostility or relentless sense of guilt or some other equally strong drive) that moves them to highly erratic behavior" (p. 282) such as hostile acts of violence. In contrast, the primary psychopath is:

...least impulsive of them all. In the [primary] psychopath, no conscience factor is interposed between desire and realization; for conscience in him is minimal or nonexistent. Rather than being hasty, the psychopath often coolly and deliberately plans his actions as seen in the case of professional criminals; there is no hot-headedness here at all...(p. 527) ...his only real interests are predatory (p. 131).

This suggests that the primary psychopath may be prone to committing relatively rare forms of predatory violence.

The possibility that psychopathic individuals may differ systematically with regard to their motivation for violent behavior suggests that it is important to take a closer look at distinct patterns of this behavior. Indeed, as Patrick and Zempolich (1998) note: “It is widely recognized that aggression is not a unitary phenomenon, and that distinctly different forms of aggressive behavior exist” (p. 307). As will be reviewed next, the social psychological literature indicates that violence is the product of diverse patterns of motivation.

Patterns of Violence: Instrumental and Reactive

A long line of research literature distinguishes between human violence that is motivated by emotions and violence that is goal-directed (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Berkowitz, 1993; Bushman & Anderson, 2001; Buss, 1961; Dodge, 1991; Feshbach, 1964; Patrick & Zempolich, 1998). Violent behavior that is emotionally motivated will be referred to as reactive violence, although it is also commonly referred to as affective, angry, impulsive, retaliatory, hostile, and defensive violence. Violent behavior that is goal-directed will be referred to as instrumental violence (also known as proactive, predatory, or appetitive violence).

The distinction between reactive and instrumental violence involves the extent to which violence is motivated by the desire to hurt another or is driven by another goal. Reactive violence is intended to inflict pain, harm or injury upon another (Buss, 1961; Feshbach, 1964, 1970). This type of violence typically occurs in response to frustration, perceived threat or some other form of provocation and is usually characterized by

emotions such as hostility, anger or irritation. According to research conducted by Cornell and colleagues (1996), reactive offenders were more likely to know their victim, feel provoked by the victim, and become violent because of anger. Reactive violence occurs under conditions of heightened anger or arousal. For example, a reactive violent incident might include a fight provoked by the actions of a friend or family member. In contrast, instrumental violence is designed to achieve some type of reward or goal other than injuring or harming another (Buss, 1961; Feshbach, 1970). According to research conducted by Cornell and colleagues (1996), instrumental offenders were more likely to commit planned violence characterized by some identifiable goal or purpose such as money or power. For example, instrumental violence might occur during a robbery, where an individual shoots someone in order to obtain money.

Instrumental motivation and reactive motivation are not mutually exclusive. Instead, violence often has both instrumental and reactive qualities. For example, a primarily instrumentally violent incident such as a robbery that goes awry may involve reactive qualities if the victim provokes or angers the robber in some way. Similarly, a primarily reactive incident may include instrumental qualities if, after fighting with the co-participant, one of the aggressors decides to steal from the other individual. In addition, most individuals who have a history of instrumental violence also have a history of reactive violence (Berkowitz, 1993; Cornell et al., 1996). Because the motivation for violence is not always neatly dichotomous, some researchers have criticized the distinction between reactive and instrumental violence (Bushman & Anderson, 2001).

Despite these criticisms, research indicates that it is possible to distinguish people who are instrumentally violent from those who are reactively violent (Cornell et al.,

1996; Cornell, Benedek, Benedek, 1987; Hartup, 1974; Price & Dodge, 1989; Pulkinnen, 1987). In addition, several researchers have suggested that this distinction may be important because those who commit some instrumental violence may be fundamentally different from those individuals who exclusively commit reactive violence. For example, Pulkinnen (1987) found that instrumental violence in adolescents was more predictive of future criminality than reactive violence. Similarly, Cornell and colleagues (1987) found that offenders who committed instrumental homicide had more personality pathology than offenders who committed reactive violence.

Thus, individuals' violence can be characterized by different motivations. As shown next, research suggests that individuals with different patterns of motivation for violence differ in their personality trait constellations (Cornell et al., 1987; Cornell et al., 1996; Pulkinnen, 1987). These differences in patterns of violence and patterns of traits are relevant to understanding the relationship between psychopathy and violence. First, it is likely that primary and secondary subtypes of psychopathic individuals are involved in different patterns of violence. Second, and in a related sense, the different dimensions of PCL-R psychopathy may have divergent relationships with different patterns of violence.

Matching Psychopathy Subtypes and Violence Patterns

Several researchers have suggested that psychopathic traits are likely to lead to instrumental violence (Patrick & Zempolich, 1998; Skeem et al., 2003; Hart & Dempster, 1997; Hemphill et al., 1998; Williamson et al., 1987; Woodworth & Porter, 2002). At a global level, psychopathy is linked conceptually with predatory and cold-hearted violence:

Particularly relevant...is the ease with which psychopaths engage in instrumental and cold-blooded violence, some of it with cruel and sadistic overtones. Emotionally unconnected to the rest of humanity, psychopaths view others as little more than objects. Thus, they find it relatively easy to dehumanize and victimize the vulnerable....Charm, manipulation, intimidation, and violence become convenient tools to gain dominance and control over others. (Ochberg et al., 2003, p. 125)

However, only a portion of traits captured by the PCL-R may relate to predatory violence. Specifically, research indicates that individuals with greater PCL-R emotional detachment are particularly prone to commit instrumental violence (Cornell et al., 1996; Hart & Dempster, 1997; Williamson et al., 1987; Woodworth & Porter, 2002). In contrast, individuals with greater PCL-R antisocial behavior may be more likely to commit reactive violence due to traits of impulsivity and hostility (Patrick & Zempolich, 1997).

To date, very few studies have examined psychopathic offenders and their patterns of motivation for violence. Cornell et al. (1996) conducted two studies to explore the possibility that instrumental offenders would have higher PCL-R psychopathy scores. In the first study, participants (n= 106) were classified into instrumental, reactive, and nonviolent offender groups based on a review of institutional records. Offenders who committed one violent crime for an identifiable purpose other than provocation or anger were classified as instrumental offenders. In addition, raters coded other offense characteristics relevant to the instrumental vs. reactive distinction including: planning, goal-directedness, provocation, anger, victim injury, and relationship with the victim. Participants who had committed at least one instrumentally violent act were classified as

instrumental offenders, given that most of the participants had a history of reactive violence and most violent crimes had both reactive and instrumental elements. The PCL-R was scored on the basis of institutional records. In contrast to conceptual links between traits of emotional detachment and instrumental violence, the authors found that instrumentally violent offenders had significantly higher psychopathy total and antisocial behavior factor scores than reactive and nonviolent offenders (Cornell et al., 1996). Specifically, the largest group differences were found for items on the antisocial behavior factor: instrumental offenders had higher levels of poor behavioral controls and impulsivity than reactive offenders.

The authors conducted a second study to overcome the methodological problems in the first study (use of legal records to score the PCL-R and raters' prior knowledge of violent behavior). In the second study, PCL-R scores for 50 violent criminal defendants were based both on written reports and videotape segments of participant interviews. The authors found that instrumentally violent offenders had significantly higher PCL-R total, emotional detachment and antisocial behavior factor scores than reactive offenders (Cornell et al., 1996). In direct contrast to the results in the first study, the biggest group differences were found for the emotional detachment factor: instrumental offenders had higher levels of manipulateness, lack of remorse, and lack of empathy. The results of these studies suggest that higher levels of PCL-R psychopathy are associated with a propensity for instrumental violence; however, the results of these two studies contradict each other and it is unclear which dimensions of PCL-R psychopathy are associated with instrumental violence.

To address this issue, Hart and Dempster (1997) reviewed the legal records of 75 offenders and rated violent offenses on the basis of the Cornell et al. (1996) instrumental vs. reactive coding system. The authors computed partial correlations between PCL-R scores and ratings of instrumental vs. reactive violence and found that the emotional detachment factor accounted for most of the relationship between total PCL-R psychopathy scores and instrumental violence. PCL-R emotional detachment scores were positively associated with planning and inversely associated with provocation and intoxication. In contrast, PCL-R antisocial behavior scores were positively associated with intoxication and inversely associated with planning. At the more global level, the emotional detachment factor was significantly associated with instrumental violence (partial $r = .26$), whereas the antisocial behavior factor had a non-significant relationship with instrumental violence (partial $r = .11$, Hart & Dempster, 1997). This research is consistent with Karpman's suggestion (1941, 1946, 1948) that primary psychopaths (high emotional detachment) are predatory, whereas secondary psychopaths (high antisocial behavior) are hotheaded and impulsive.

Although the above research suffers from several methodological limitations (procedures used to score the PCL-R, use of criminal records to classify violence) and requires replication, these findings further support the notion that individuals with high scores on the PCL-R differ in their motivation for violence. Thus, a more textured view of both psychopathy and violence may lead to a clearer view of the relation between these two variables.

Integration: A Nuanced View of Psychopathy and Violence

Although research suggests that psychopathy is a robust predictor of future violence (Hart, 1998), this research is based on a measure – the PCL-R – that confounds the core traits of psychopathy with impulsive and antisocial behavior (Lilienfeld, 1994). A closer look at the relationship between the PCL-R and violence indicates that the antisocial behavior factor is reliably related to violence, whereas the core features of emotional detachment are only weakly so (Skeem et al., 2003; Skeem & Mulvey, 2001; Walters, 2003). This contradicts the common assumption that emotional detachment drives violent behavior.

It is time to examine this assumption more closely. Research must go beyond the simple statement that PCL-R scores and violence are linked, to examine the nature and form of that connection. Several hypotheses could be tested. For example, interpersonally, psychopathic individuals are grandiose and egocentric which might lead to a desire to dominate and humiliate others. Psychopathic individuals also lack what Karpman called “higher human emotions” (e.g., empathy, remorse), which typically inhibit violent behavior. This lack of emotion might lead to an increased propensity to commit violence or might lead to more serious violence. In particular, the emotional detachment or primary traits of psychopathy are likely to lead to predatory or instrumental violence. Finally, psychopathic individuals lead an impulsive lifestyle that might result in risky behaviors that lead to a higher risk for violence (Cooke et al., 2004; Hart, 1998). Specifically, the impulsive, hostile, and antisocial or secondary traits of psychopathy may lead to hotheaded, reactive violence.

There are reasons to believe that a careful examination of such hypotheses will enhance our understanding of whether and how *psychopathy per se* relates to violence. First, research that examines specific types of *violence* may clarify the nature of the relationship between psychopathy and violence. Specifically, questions have arisen about the utility of the core traits of PCL-R psychopathy in violence risk prediction and some investigators have asserted that the core traits of psychopathy are unrelated to violence. However, it may be that the core traits of PCL-R psychopathy are related to relatively rare forms of predatory violence rather than more common forms of reactive violence. Second, research that takes a more nuanced view of *psychopathy* may help clarify this relationship. Different variants of psychopathy may be involved in different forms of violence. For example, primary psychopaths are cold and calculating individuals who lack anxiety. These individuals may be prone to commit instrumental violence to fulfill their selfish desires. In contrast, secondary psychopaths are impulsive and hostile. It is likely that these individuals have a tendency to commit reactive violence in response to perceived provocation.

This suggests that it is time to take a more refined view of the relation between PCL-R psychopathy and violence. Relatively little research has examined the relationship between violence and less antisocially loaded models of the PCL-R. Further, research has yet to replicate the finding that the various dimensions of psychopathy have distinct relationships with different types of violence. In addition, no published research to date has examined homogenous subgroups of psychopathic individuals and the possibility that these subgroups differ in their motivation for violence.

Study Aims

The proposed thesis has two overarching goals and four aims. The first goal of the proposed thesis is to clarify the nature of the relationship between psychopathy and violence. This first goal is focused on the different factors of PCL-R psychopathy and how they relate to violence. Thus, this goal is centered on the distinct *dimensions* of psychopathy. Two aims are associated with this first goal.

The first aim is to (a) determine whether the core personality traits of psychopathy uniquely predict violence and (b) determine whether and how these psychopathic personality traits interact to maximally predict violence. Given the findings of previous research, I expect that the PCL-R lifestyle and criminal factors will best predict future violence, followed by the PCL-R interpersonal factor. I do not expect the PCL-R affective factor to be significantly associated with future violence. I expect no interactions (i.e. only the criminal and behavioral factors will be necessary to maximally predict violence).

The second aim is to explore whether different dimensions of psychopathy are associated with differing motivation for violence. Little research has closely examined this issue. The notion that psychopaths are more likely to commit instrumental violence makes intuitive sense because they tend to be callous, unemotional, and egocentric. Given previous research, I expect to find that the core features of psychopathy (interpersonal and affective factors) are related to an instrumental pattern of violent behavior. More specifically, I expect to find that the interpersonal features of psychopathy will be related to more dominating forms of violence, such as violence committed to obtain power or violence with sadistic motives. In contrast, I expect that

either the lifestyle features of psychopathy will be more highly associated with a reactive pattern of violence *or* they may also be related to an instrumental pattern of violence characterized by a desire for material gain and accompanied by other criminal or risky behaviors, given the relation between the lifestyle features and criminal behavior.

The second goal of the proposed thesis is to examine homogenous subgroups of “psychopathic” individuals and their propensity and motivation for violence. This second goal focuses on distinct subgroups of psychopathic individuals. Thus, this goal is centered on individuals rather than the dimensions of psychopathy. Two aims are associated with this second goal.

The first aim is to assess whether primary and secondary psychopaths differ in terms of their likelihood for future violence. Research suggests that secondary (high anxious) psychopaths are more likely to have the secondary symptoms associated with psychopathy whereas primary (low anxious) psychopaths are more likely to be characterized by the core features of psychopathy. I expect to find that secondary psychopaths will be more likely to commit violence than primary psychopaths.

The second aim is to examine whether primary and secondary psychopaths differ in terms of instrumental vs. reactive motivation for violence. Despite suggestions that there are homogenous groups of psychopaths with different motivations for violence (Patrick & Zempolich 1998), little research examines this issue directly. I expect to find that violence committed by primary psychopaths will be characterized by an instrumental pattern of violence, whereas I expect secondary psychopaths to have a more reactive pattern of violence.

This project has direct implications for (1) treatment recommendations and (2) violence risk assessment. First, research that seeks to closely examine how the features of psychopathy and violence relate might lead to more informed treatment recommendations for violent psychopathic offenders. For example, if the secondary symptoms of psychopathy are found to be associated with hostile or reactive violence, treatment might focus on managing emotional arousal and controlling impulses to prevent these offenders from committing violence in the future. Exploring the different features of psychopathy, and their relationships with different motivations for violent behavior may bring the field closer to fully understanding how the core features of psychopathy influence violent behavior.

Second, violence risk assessment has serious ethical implications for professionals as well as important legal implications for offenders. Thus, it is essential to resolve disagreements regarding the use of psychopathy as a predictor for future violence. As Rogers (1995) notes: "The PCL-R is a polythetic model, with more than 15,000 possible variations of psychopathy (i.e., different combinations of symptom scores greater than or equal to symbol 30). Whether every score of 30 or above presents the same risk [for violence] has yet to be empirically assessed" (p. 241). Resolving this issue is crucial given that the use of the PCL-R in the context of violence risk assessment could lead to inaccurate and uninformed clinical and legal decisions. However, criticisms of the PCL-R and questions about the homogeneity of psychopathy indicate that the relationship between psychopathy and violence is far from straightforward.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This thesis was designed as a follow-up study to a separate, multi-state research project funded by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). This document refers to these studies as the “follow-up study” and the “NIMH study” respectively. The follow-up study capitalizes upon a unique opportunity to make use of a large random subsample of prison inmates and substance abuse clients enrolled in the Nevada sites of the NIMH study. This sample is ideal for addressing the aims of this thesis because prevalence rates of psychopathy in these populations are relatively high (Alterman et al., 1998; Hare, 1999; Rutherford, Cacciola, Alterman, & McKay, 1997). Approximately 90 days after enrollment in the NIMH study, participants in the follow-up study were located and re-interviewed.

This thesis makes use not only of the NIMH study sample, but also some of the NIMH data (e.g., on psychopathy and anxiety). Because the accuracy of the data collected in the follow-up study partially depends on that of the NIMH study, relevant methodological aspects of the NIMH study will be addressed in this chapter. In the first section, the NIMH participants, measures, and procedures will be discussed. In the second section, the follow-up study participants, measures, and procedures will be discussed.

The NIMH Study

Participants

Participants in the Nevada sites of the NIMH study were 341 (74.9%) prison inmates selected from two prisons, and 114 (25.1%) substance abuse clients selected from one residential substance abuse facility (N = 455). Eligibility requirements for the NIMH study included: 1) age 21–40 years, 2) Caucasian or African American race, 3) English speaking, 4) estimated IQ ≥ 70 , and 5) no current prescribed medication for psychosis. Participants from the substance abuse site were required to have completed detoxification before participating in the study. The majority of participants were African American (51.6%) men (84%). The average age of participants was 31.7 years (SD=7.3). Virtually none (3%) of the participants were of Hispanic ethnicity.

Instruments

The instruments described here are part of a larger protocol designed to address the aims of the NIMH study. Here, only measures relevant for use in this thesis will be discussed. These measures assess 1) demographics, 2) intelligence, 3) reading ability, 4) psychopathy, and 5) trait anxiety.

Demographics

Demographic information (e.g., age, ethnicity, gender) was obtained from each participant via self-report and was verified through a review of institutional records.

Intelligence

The Quick Test (QT; Ammons & Ammons, 1962) is a brief intelligence-screening test developed to measure verbal-perceptual abilities. The QT includes a list of 50 words and can be administered in 3-10 minutes. The examiner shows the participant a card with

four pictures and reads a word aloud. The participant is then to indicate the correct picture on the card. The examiner continues administering items until the participant receives six consecutive wrong answers (Ammons & Ammons, 1962).

The QT provides a good estimate of normal range IQ scores (Traub & Spruill, 1982). The QT is a moderately good predictor of WAIS-R IQ scores in males ($r = .73$) and females ($r = .86$), as well as in African American ($r = .75$) and Caucasian ($r = .83$) individuals (Craig & Olsen, 1988). In addition, the QT provides a fairly accurate estimate of WAIS-R IQ scores in correctional populations ($r = .66-.90$; DeCato & Husband, 1984). Internal consistency and test-retest reliability estimates have not been reported.

Reading Ability

The Basic Reading Inventory (BRI; Johns, 1997) was used to assess the reading ability of participants who had not completed the 10th grade or received a GED and who could not successfully read the first few items from the first self-report measure, the Personality Assessment Inventory. These participants were asked to silently read a 9th grade level passage from the BRI and then to complete an oral test of comprehension. The validity of the reading passages in the BRI have been evaluated using a readability computer program, educational user and professional feedback and field-testing. In addition, the BRI is widely used in academic settings as a test of reading comprehension (Johns, 1997). Reliability coefficients for the BRI have not been reported. If participants did not pass the BRI, all self-report measures were read aloud to the participants.

Psychopathy

The *Psychopathy Checklist Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 1991, 2003)* was used in the NIMH study to assess psychopathy. The PCL-R is the most widely used assessment of psychopathy and is a measure that was developed specifically for assessing psychopathic features in correctional populations. The PCL-R was developed on the basis of both Cleckleyan criteria (described above) and a list of traits and behaviors that Hare (1991) believed discriminated between psychopaths and non-psychopaths. The PCL-R consists of 20 items scored by a trained rater on a 3-point scale: 0 (item does not apply), 1 (item applies somewhat), or 2 (item definitely applies). These items are scored on the basis of a lengthy semi-structured interview (1.5 hours) and a detailed review of available file information. The PCL-R yields both total scores and factor scores.

PCL-R total scores have been shown to be internally consistent in previous research ($\alpha = .83-.91$ for prison inmates; Hare, 1991) and were internally consistent in this study sample ($\alpha = .82$). Test-retest reliability was reported to be .94 in a sample of substance abuse clients (Hare, 1991). Inter-rater reliability for PCL-R total scores is also high (ICC = .80; Hare, 1991). Studies also suggest that reliability estimates for PCL-R total scores do not differ significantly for African Americans and Caucasians, and ethnic differences in mean scores are fairly small (Hare, 1991, 2003; Kosson et al., 1990; Skeem, Edens, Camp, Colwell, 2004).

In the NIMH study, the three-factor model was found to fit better than competing models (Skeem et al., 2003). The proposed thesis applies this three-factor model, but also includes Hare's criminality factor to explore its relation to violence. In addition, supplemental analyses will be conducted with the two-factor model to permit replication

of the existing literature, which largely still focuses on the two-factor model. The properties of these different factor models will now be reviewed in turn.

The traditional two-factor model consists of two correlated factors ($r = .50$): the emotional detachment factor and the antisocial behavior factor (please see above for a description of these factors and their validity). Factor scores are obtained by summing eight items for the emotional detachment factor and nine items for the antisocial behavior factor. Previous research suggests that both the emotional detachment factor ($\alpha = .83$) and the antisocial behavior factor ($\alpha = .77$) are internally consistent (Hare, 1991). The inter-rater reliabilities for the emotional detachment and antisocial behavior factors are .76 and .83 respectively (Hare, 1991). In this study, the emotional detachment and antisocial behavior factor were highly correlated ($r = .48$). Internal consistency for the emotional detachment factor in this sample ($\alpha = .86$) was comparable to previous research, whereas internal consistency for the antisocial behavior factor was somewhat lower ($\alpha = .58$).

The alternative PCL-R factor models include Cooke and Michie's (2001) three-factor model (interpersonal, affective and, lifestyle factors) and Hare's (2003) four-factor model (interpersonal, affective, lifestyle, and criminality factors). For the three-factor model factor scores are obtained by summing four items for the interpersonal factor, four items for the affective factor, and five items for the lifestyle factor. Scores for Hare's (2003) fourth factor (criminality) are obtained by summing five items.

Research indicates that the four PCL-R factors have acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha > .66$; Hare, 2003; Salekin, Brannen, Zalot, Leistico, & Neumann, 2005; Vitacco et al., 2005) and good inter-rater reliability (Hall et al., 2004). Factors in the three-factor model

(interpersonal, affective and lifestyle) are also highly inter-correlated (F1vF2, $r = .71$; F1vF3, $r = .68$; F2vF3, $r = .73$; Cooke & Michie, 2001). In this study, the interpersonal ($\alpha = .79$) and affective ($\alpha = .81$) factors were more internally consistent than the lifestyle ($\alpha = .49$) and criminality factors ($\alpha = .58$). In this study, correlations among the three factors are comparable to previous research, and the criminality factor had smaller correlations with the other three factors (see Table 7).

Table 7
Correlation Matrix for the four PCL-R factors

Factor	Interpersonal	Affective	Lifestyle	Criminality
Interpersonal				
Affective	0.61			
Lifestyle	0.48	0.44		
Criminality	0.19	0.32	0.32	

Research supports the validity of the three-factor model and indicates that the interpersonal, affective and lifestyle factors relate in a coherent pattern with theoretically relevant variables when the other PCL-R factors are controlled (Hall et al., 2004). The interpersonal factor is associated with the ability to influence others (partial $r = .34$), low levels of anxiety (partial $r = -.25$), negative affect (partial $r = -.20$) and stress (partial $r = -.24$; Hall et al., 2004). The affective factor is associated with a low desire for close relationships (partial $r = -.22$; Hall et al., 2004). Finally, the lifestyle factor is related to aggression (partial $r = .29$), impulsivity (partial $r = .30$) and anger (partial $r = .23$; Hall et al., 2004). Hare's (2003) criminality factor is highly associated with a history of violence ($r = .41$; Hall et al., 2004).

Trait Anxiety

Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI; Morey, 1991). The PAI is a 344-item, self-report measure designed to assess clinical symptoms. PAI items are rated on a four-point scale: 1 (false, not at all true), 2 (slightly true), 3 (mainly true), and 4 (very true). We used one clinical subscale of the PAI, the Anxiety scale, to assess trait anxiety. The Anxiety scale consists of 24 items that assess cognitive (“expectation of harm, ruminative worry, and cognitive beliefs”, p. 70), affective (“feelings of tension, panic, and nervousness”, p. 70), and physiological (“racing heart, sweaty palms, rapid breathing, and dizziness”, p. 70) symptoms. The scale is internally consistent ($\alpha = .87$), and relates in theoretically coherent ways with other scales, including well-established measures of trait anxiety (Morey, 1991).

Training

Two graduate student RAs completed training for two and a half days to administer and reliably score the NIMH study’s measures. The training included PCL-R training (by Stephen Hart at Simon Fraser University) and scoring of several practice videotapes. In order to maintain reliable interviewing and PCL-R scoring, regular site visits were made by the principle investigator of the NIMH study. During these site visits, the principle investigator observed RAs during their PCL-R interviews and independently scored the PCL-R. Inter-rater reliability of PCL-R total scores, obtained on the basis of 51 cases, was good (ICC=.88).

Procedure

Participant Selection

Prison and substance abuse participants were selected using different procedures. Prison participants were randomly selected (using the random number generator at www.randomizer.org) on the basis of lists of all eligible inmates provided by prison staff. All eligible substance abuse clients were recruited for participation on the basis of lists provided by staff.

To ensure a sufficient number of participants for the various follow-up portions of the NIMH study, participants were selected based on their recency of admission to each facility. All recruited substance abuse clients and approximately 50% of recruited inmates were new admissions. These new admissions permitted RA's to code participants' degree of treatment improvement (substance abuse) and institutional infractions (prison) during the NIMH study follow-ups. The remaining inmates were recruited close to discharge to permit follow-ups focused on re-arrest.

During the last year of the study (starting February 2004) the substance abuse facility was no longer a viable site for data collection given logistical constraints (snow, distance, disorganization) and low numbers of participants. This site was replaced with a second prison site for the remainder of the study.

Material Administration

The entire protocol was administered in two separate sessions during a one-week time period. Before administering the NIMH study protocol, the research assistant ensured that 1) the participant understood the informed consent form, 2) the participant met IQ requirements and 3) the participant was able to read the materials unassisted.

First, prospective participants were invited to participate in a private room and informed consent was obtained. To ensure that participants understood the informed consent form, a brief five-item multiple-choice quiz was administered before participants completed any study materials. This quiz was intended to assess participant understanding of the important aspects of taking part in a research study (e.g., voluntary participation, confidentiality, risks). If the participant answered more than two questions incorrectly they were excluded from the NIMH study. If the participant answered less than three questions incorrectly, this information was clarified before beginning the study.

Next, to ensure that participants had an IQ of 70 or more, the QT (Ammons & Ammons, 1962) was administered. Participants who obtained an estimated IQ that was less than 70 were excluded from participation. The PAI was administered next, followed by the rest of the measures included in the NIMH study. Participants who could not successfully read the first few items from the PAI received the BRI (Johns, 1997). If these participants failed to demonstrate at least a 9th grade reading level, or experienced any difficulty in reading the materials themselves, the self-report questionnaires were read aloud. The PCL-R was administered near the end of the second testing session to allow time for the interviewer to develop rapport with each participant. Upon completion of the study, participants were paid \$20.

After completing all study materials, participants were asked if they were interested in being contacted for future research studies. If they were interested they provided permission and contact information, including their own phone numbers and addresses if applicable, the phone numbers and addresses of any close family members and friends, as

well as employer information. They were also asked to provide information about where they expected to live once released from prison or substance abuse treatment.

The Follow-up Study

Participants

As noted earlier, participants in the follow-up study are a sub-sample of those who completed the NIMH study. Participants were located and then interviewed in the community, in the substance abuse facility, or in the prisons approximately 90 days after their participation in the NIMH study. The 90-day follow-up period was selected for optimum retention of the original sample, given the transient nature of inmate and substance abuse populations.

Recruitment

After obtaining the names and contact information of NIMH participants who provided permission to be contacted for future research, RAs located these individuals and invited them to participate in the follow-up study. There were two different recruitment procedures, depending on whether or not prospective participants were still institutionalized at the time of recruitment. Individuals who were still in prison or in the substance abuse facility were brought to a private room in the institution and invited to participate. Individuals who had been released into the community were more difficult to recruit. Given the transient nature of the population of interest, an extensive, three-stage recruitment protocol was designed to avoid systematic sampling bias (see Schubert, Mulvey, et al., 2005) and is described below in detail.

The first stage (“recruitment window”) began one month after the individual completed the NIMH study. During this phase, letters of invitation were sent to these individuals, and RAs attempted to call these individuals daily, at different times of the day. Potential participants, as well as their friends and family members, were called on all available phone numbers. Potential participants who were contacted during the recruitment window were invited to participate and informed that they would be contacted in the next few weeks to schedule an appointment (near the 90-day target date). This stage of recruitment was intended to establish contact with each prospective participant early (before the target window defined below) so that interviews could be conducted as close to the 90-day target date as possible.

The second stage (“target window”) began three months (to the date) after the individual completed the NIMH study. During this stage, contact attempts were increased and tailored to each prospective participant. For example, frequently the contact information provided was no longer working, so RAs searched the Internet for new contact information. In addition, RAs searched the Nevada Department of Corrections and Clark County websites to determine whether the individual had returned to incarceration. If an individual did not have a working phone number but had a physical address, RAs would travel to the individual’s home to initiate contact. If successful contact was made during the target window, an interview was scheduled as close as possible to the specified 90-day target date.

The third and final stage (“late window”) began about four months after NIMH study completion. During this stage, recruitment efforts were again increased. In addition to increased phone contact and in-person visits, a final letter was sent to each individual.

Exactly five months after participation in the NIMH study, each individual was dropped from the list and called a “recruitment failure.” A period of five months was chosen because the follow-up study requires participants to remember violence that has taken place in a specified time period. Research shows that longer follow-up periods decrease accuracy due to memory recall problems.

Retention

Of the total NIMH study sample ($n = 455$), 23.3% were not eligible for participation in the follow-up study because (1) they did not provide permission to be contacted (9.5%) or (2) they were too far past the 90-day follow-up period at the time the follow-up study began (approximately nine months after recruitment for the NIMH study began) and were not actively recruited (13.8%). Thus, 76.7% ($n = 349$) of the original NIMH study sample were eligible for participation and were actively recruited for the follow-up study. We were able to retain 60.2% ($n = 210$) of the eligible NIMH participants with an average follow-up period of 102 days. The majority of recruitment failures were due to participants’ moving out of the surrounding area (15.5%), followed by a general failure to schedule and conduct an interview within the defined follow-up period (14.3%), and refusal to participate (10.0%).

Participants were 174 prison inmates, and 36 substance abuse clients. The majority of participants were men (90.0%). Because only a very small number of women ($n = 21$) were recruited, they were not included in this thesis, leaving a total sample of 189 participants. Male participants were nearly split with regard to ethnicity; 50.8% of the sample was African American and 49.2% of the sample was Caucasian. The average age of participants was 31.45 years ($sd = 6.97$).

Prison and substance abuse participants were compared on important study variables such as ethnicity, age, and PCL-R scores, given that large differences between these qualitatively different samples are likely to impact the statistical results of this thesis. Prison participants were significantly different from substance abuse participants with regard to ethnicity (Chi-square (1) = 9.26, $p = .002$) and age ($t(175) = -3.27$, $p = .001$). Specifically, prison participants were more likely to be African American (55.7%), whereas substance abuse participants were more likely to be Caucasian (74.2%). With regard to age, prison participants were significantly younger ($M = 30.69$, $sd = 6.40$) than substance abuse participants ($M = 35.13$, $sd = 8.45$). Prison participants were also significantly different from substance abuse participants with regard to PCL-R scores (see Table 8). These statistical differences will be addressed in the analyses section of this thesis.

Table 8
PCL-R Score Comparisons in Prison vs. Substance Abuse Participants

PCL-R Scale	Prison		Substance Abuse		$t(181)$
	M	SD	M	SD	
Total Scores	25.00	7.01	22.10	8.95	2.00*
Two-Factor Model					
Emotional Detachment	9.65	4.38	8.80	4.69	0.96
Antisocial Behavior	13.49	3.37	12.17	4.15	1.87 ⁺
Four PCL-R Factors					
Interpersonal	4.08	2.47	4.63	2.62	-1.10
Affective	5.60	2.39	4.20	3.28	2.93**
Lifestyle	6.54	1.83	6.27	2.52	0.70
Criminality	7.70	2.28	6.00	2.28	2.10*

** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$. ⁺ $p < .10$.

Additionally, the follow-up and NIMH study participants were compared on key study variables to determine whether the follow-up sample is representative of the NIMH sample. The follow-up sample was not significantly different from the NIMH sample with regard to ethnicity (Chi-square (1) = 2.22, $p = .136$) or age ($t(379) = -.19$, $p = .850$). The follow-up sample was not significantly different from the NIMH sample with regard to PCL-R scores (see Table 9). In sum, the male follow-up study participants do not differ significantly from the NIMH study participants with regard to ethnicity, age, or PCL-R scores. Thus, it is likely that the follow-up study participants are a representative sample of the original NIMH study sample.

Table 9
PCL-R Score Comparisons in NIMH vs. Follow-up Sample

PCL-R Scale	Follow-up		NIMH		$t(349)$
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Total Scores	24.50	7.42	24.70	7.06	0.18
Two-Factor Model					
Emotional Detachment	9.51	4.43	9.74	3.99	0.50
Antisocial Behavior	13.28	3.52	13.00	3.65	-0.74
Four PCL-R Factors					
Interpersonal	4.20	2.50	4.43	2.33	0.97
Affective	5.30	2.44	5.30	2.26	-0.10
Lifestyle	6.50	1.96	6.30	1.85	-0.74
Criminality	6.80	2.36	6.70	2.51	-0.32

* $p < .05$.

Measures⁵

The measures administered in this thesis were designed to assess the criterion variable of violence. For the purposes of this thesis, serious violence and minor violence will be defined based on the definition used in the MacArthur Violence Risk Assessment study (Monahan et al., 2001). Serious violence is defined as intentional physical aggression that results in injury, sexual assault, threats made with a weapon in hand, or use of a weapon. Minor violence is defined as all intentional physical aggression that does not result in injury.

Monahan et al. (2001) made this distinction because: “The factors related to more serious violence may or may not be the same ones associated with less serious violence” (p. 18). This distinction is important for this thesis because the degree of violence may be differentially related to motivation for violence in psychopathic individuals. In addition, the psychopathic personality features related to serious violence may not be the same as the psychopathic personality features related to or minor violence. Finally, serious violence has more practical implications, given that it is more likely to result in legal repercussions.

Two interview-based measures were used to assess violence that occurred recently (during the 90-day follow-up period) and during the participant’s lifetime. Participants’ institutional records were also reviewed to obtain the most plausible accounts of violent behavior that had occurred during the follow-up period or during the participant’s lifetime. Thus, ratings of violence will be based on two sources of information: self-report and legal records. In the sections below, I will present the two interview-based

⁵ The measures included in the proposed thesis are part of a larger protocol intended to address research questions that go beyond the aims of the proposed thesis. Only relevant measures will be discussed here.

measures used in this thesis: the Recent Violence Interview and the Lifetime Violence interview, as well as outline how legal records were reviewed.

Future Violence

Violence that occurred during the 90-day follow-up period was assessed using the measure that was used in the largest violence risk assessment study of psychiatric patients conducted to date (Monahan et al., 2001; see also Lidz, Mulvey & Gardner, 1993). The Recent Violence Interview (see Appendix I) is a derivative of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Strauss & Gelles, 1990). The Recent Violence Interview provides a very detailed description of participant violence. This interview was used to determine whether participants had committed serious violence or minor violence, as defined above, over the 90-day follow-up period and was used in the violence prediction portion of this thesis.

The Recent Violence Interview was administered and coded in a three-step process. First, an RA asked the participant whether he or she had been the victim of, or perpetrated, the following eight categories of acts, during the 90-day follow-up period: (a) throwing objects; (b) pushing, grabbing, or shoving; (c) slapping; (d) kicking, biting, or choking; (e) hitting with a fist; (f) sexual assault; (g) threatening with a weapon; and (h) using a weapon. Next, the RA determined the number of times each violent act was committed and asked the participant to describe each incident. If an incident included multiple acts of violence, only the most serious act of violence per incident was coded. Finally, the RA obtained a detailed description of each incident from beginning to end and coded the date and location of the incident, the participant's relationship with the victim, the most serious act of violence, the degree of injury, and (if a weapon was involved) the weapon location. Based on these textured descriptions, the RA indicated

whether, in his or her judgment, the incident was planned, was goal-directed, was in self-defense, or was provoked.

The Recent Violence Interview improves upon other methods of assessing violence (e.g., record review, self-report questionnaires) by providing a specific definition of violence and by examining the context of each incident. According to Monahan et al. (2001), this method of assessing violence outperformed the use of both collateral and legal records to measure participant involvement in violence. Although reliability coefficients for this interview are unavailable, this method of measuring violence has been widely used by psychopathy researchers and is related in expected ways to violence risk factors (Lidz et al., 1993; Monahan et al., 2001).

Participants were classified as violent if they committed one or more acts of violence. To determine whether participants were violent, each incident was coded on the basis of the eight categories of violent acts. Participants who had committed one or more acts of violence were classified as violent (18.9%). Participants who committed serious acts of violence (physical aggression that resulted in injury, threats with a weapon, or use of a weapon) were classified as seriously violent (8.9%) and participants who committed minor acts of violence (acts of physical aggression that did not result in injury) were classified as aggressive (10.0%). None of the participants committed sexual assault during the 90-day follow-up period.

The mean number of violent incidents committed during the 90-day follow-up period was 1.39 ($sd = .80$). The majority of participants who were violent committed one violent incident (77.8%; two incidents, 8.3%; three incidents, 11.1%; four incidents, 2.8%) during the 90-day follow-up period. The majority of participant violence was

characterized by “hitting or beating up” another person (see Table 10). Because most (80.4%) of the interviews were conducted while participants were still incarcerated and had not had access to the community, violence most commonly occurred in prison (70%) and typically the co-participant was known to the participant, but not well known (78%; in general the co-participant was another inmate). The most common injury was bruises or cuts (40%; 4% unconscious, internal injury, broken bones or teeth; 2% stab or gunshot), however most co-participants were not injured (54%). Most participants who committed violence did not use a weapon (88%), were not drinking (94%) or using drugs (94%), and were not punished (92%). Typically, violence was unplanned (84%), was provoked (90%; but participants were unlikely to be violent in self-defense), and 50% of violent incidents were committed by participants for some kind of goal.

Table 10
Frequency of Violent Acts

Violent Act	Number of Participants	Percentage
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved	12	33.33
Slapped	0	0.00
Kicked, bit, or choked	4	11.11
Hit or beat up	15	41.67
Force sex	0	0.00
Weapon threat	1	2.78
Weapon use	3	8.33
Anything else	1	2.78
Total	36	100.00

Note. Participants who committed more than one act of violence (n=8) were counted once; only their most serious act of violence is included in this table.

Because the recent violence ratings of the most serious act of violence and the degree of injury were used to classify participants as violent and aggressive, the inter-rater

reliability of these ratings was assessed. Inter-rater reliability for the categorical ratings (location, weapon type, weapon threat, the presence of alcohol or drug use, punishment, and judgments of planning, goal-directedness, provocation, and self-defense) was assessed using kappa. Typically, kappa values of .75 and greater reflect excellent agreement; .60-.74, good agreement; .40-.59, fair agreement; and .00-.40, poor agreement (Cicchetti & Sparrow, 1981). On the basis of 39 cases, results indicate that inter-rater reliability was “good” to “excellent” for all 10 ratings (Kappa > .63; see Table 11).

Table 11
Interrater reliability: Recent Violence Ratings

Rating	Kappa Value	Standard Deviation
Location	.88	.06
Weapon type	.91	.08
Weapon threat	.70	.17
Alcohol use	1.00	.00
Drug use	1.00	.00
Punishment	1.00	.00
Planning	.84	.11
Goal-directedness	.93	.05
Provocation	.64	.19
Self-defense	.87	.07

Inter-rater reliability for ordinal ratings (most serious act, relationship with the victim, and degree of injury) was assessed using intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC). ICC's were computed using a two-way mixed effects analysis of variance model, with raters as a fixed factor and an absolute definition of agreement. According to general guidelines used by Parkerson, Broadhead, and Tse (1993), ICCs above 0.75 are excellent; 0.40-0.75 are fair-good; and below 0.40 are poor. On the basis of 39 cases, inter-rater reliability

was “excellent” for all ratings (most serious act of violence, ICC = .98; relationship with the victim, ICC = .75; degree of injury to the participant, ICC = .90; degree of injury to the victim, ICC = .99).

Lifetime Violence

The Lifetime Violence Interview was derived from previous relevant research (Cornell et al., 1996) to assess the extent to which participants’ pattern of violence reflects instrumental vs. reactive motivation for violence. First, participants were asked to think about and recall the most serious conflicts that they had had with others over the course of their lives: specifically, they were asked to think of times where they had laid their hands on another person. Next, the RA asked participants to describe the three most serious conflicts that had ever happened in their lives. Finally, the RA elicited each incident in detail from beginning to end using specific probe questions and coded the most serious act of violence for each incident, based on the Violence Checklist (see Appendix II).

Information obtained from the Lifetime Violence Interview was used to rate the extent to which each incident was instrumental vs. reactive. These ratings were based on the information recorded on the Aggressive Incident Coding Sheet (AICS; Cornell, 1993). The AICS consists of nine dimensional items: eight ratings of the characteristics of each violent incident including: (a) planning; (b) goal-directness; (c) provocation; (d) arousal; (e) severity of violence; (f) relationship with victim; (g) intoxication; and (h) psychosis; and a rating of overall instrumental vs. reactive motivation for violence. The instrumental vs. reactive rating is made on a four-point scale: 1 (clearly reactive), 2 (primarily reactive, some instrumental qualities), 3 (primarily instrumental, some reactive

qualities), and 4 (clearly instrumental). This final judgment is an overall judgment based on the entire violent incident and participant motivation for violence (please see Appendix III for the AICS rating sheet).

Cornell et al. (1996) examined the inter-rater reliability of the AICS coding sheet in two studies. The AICS ratings in these studies were based on information contained in legal records. In the first study, with a sample of 20 criminal defendants, inter-rater reliability for the instrumental vs. reactive rating was excellent ($ICC = .98$) and excellent for all other ratings ($ICC > .80$). In the second study, with a sample of 33 offenders, inter-rater reliability for the instrumental vs. reactive rating was excellent ($ICC = .93$) and fair-good for all other ratings ($ICC > .70$).

For the purposes of this thesis, 11 additional ratings (see Appendix IV) were added to more specifically capture the motivation for violent behavior. Six of these ratings capture the extent to which violence was characterized by specific goals for violence including: power/domination, respect, material gain, anger, and fear. Five of these ratings capture the extent to which violence was accompanied by criminal or risky behavior including: substance abuse, drug dealing, gang involvement, sensation seeking, or other criminal/risky behavior. Finally, one rating captures an apparent lack of motivation for violence, or violent behavior that the reasonable person finds difficult to understand.

These 11 ratings were added because the instrumental vs. reactive dimension fails to capture the finer variations in an individual's motivation for violence. For example, a person who commits a sadistic violent act with a goal of power clearly differs from someone who commits violence to obtain drugs; however, the current AICS rating system does not capture such qualitative differences between individuals. These

additional ratings are based on previous literature that has attempted to elaborate on the AICS coding sheet (Cornell, 2003; Murrie, Cornell, Kaplan, McConville, & Levy-Elkon, 2004; Pardini, Lochman, & Frick, 2003; Porter, Woodworth, Earle, Drugge, & Boer, 2003; Woodworth & Porter, 2003).

According to the AICS coding manual, participants can either be classified into different groups or given dimensional scores for the overall instrumental vs. reactive rating. Cornell et al. (1996) classified offenders into instrumental and reactive groups. Offenders were classified as instrumental if they had committed one instrumentally violent act. However, this results in a loss of information because motivation for violence can include both instrumental and reactive qualities (Cornell et al., 1996). Therefore, for the purposes of this thesis, the overall rating of instrumental vs. reactive motivation for violence was treated as dimensional. In addition, the eight violence characteristics and the 11 goals for violence were treated as dimensional.

Because dimensional ratings were used, scores were summarized into a single rating for each participant. We used two methods to summarize these ratings. The first was to average the eight violence characteristics, 11 goals for violence, and the overall rating of instrumental vs. reactive motivation for violence across the three lifetime violent incidents. However, this method ignores intra-individual variability and thus results in a loss of information if there is high variability across each participant's three violent incidents. The second method was to calculate scores for these ratings for the most serious lifetime violent incident. However, this method ignores two of the three violent incidents and also results in a loss of information. Therefore, ICCs were calculated to determine whether the average ratings were comparable to the ratings for the most

serious violent incident. Agreement between the average ratings and the most serious ratings was fair-good ($ICC > .66$ for all ratings). Thus, average ratings were used, given that these ratings include all points of data and likely result in less error variance.

The majority of participants (77.2%) had been involved in at least three violent incidents during their lifetime; however, 13.2% had only participated in two violent incidents, 7.4% in one incident, and 2.1% of the sample reported that they had never been involved in violence. Most participants (92.6%) committed at least one serious act of lifetime violence (defined above as sexual assault, use of a weapon, threats with a weapon in hand, or physical aggression that results in injury). The majority of violent incidents involved “hitting or beating up” the victim (52.9%), however, 26.9% of violent incidents included the use of a weapon (throwing something, .6%; pushing/grabbing/shoving, 5.6%; slapped, 3.6%; kicking/biting/choking, 2.6%; forcing sex, .6%; weapon threat, 5.6%; other, 1.6%). Notably, 48.4% of participants indicated that they had used a weapon at least once over the course of their lives. The majority of violent incidents were characterized by clearly reactive motivation (59.0%; 14.3% primarily reactive; 13.8% primarily instrumental; 12.9% clearly instrumental). The most common violent incident involved an unknown victim, and was characterized by primarily reactive motivation for violence, little to no planning, no apparent goal-directedness, mild provocation, moderate levels of arousal (angry, mad, extremely frightened), minor injuries (bruises, cuts), no intoxication, and no psychotic symptoms.

In terms of specific goals for violence, most participants committed violence to attain respect, or because they were angry. The majority of the sample had at least one violent incident that was motivated by respect (64.9%) or anger (60.0%). The other specific

goals were less common, specifically, 24.3% of the sample committed at least violent incident to attain power, 23.8% for material gain, and 3.8% committed at least one violent incident because they were afraid. The majority of participants were not engaged in other criminal or risky behavior at the time they committed violence, however 19.5% of participant violence was accompanied by gang activity at least once and 18.4% of participant violence was accompanied by drug dealing at least once. A small minority of participants ($n = 8$) committed at least one violent incident that had no apparent motivation, or no specific motivation that the reasonable person could understand.

The inter-rater reliability of the lifetime violence ratings (instrumental vs. reactive motivation for violence, violence characteristics, goals for violence, the violence checklist) was assessed on the basis of 26 cases, using intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC). First, to assess the inter-rater reliability of the instrumental vs. reactive motivation for violence and violence characteristic ratings, ICCs were computed using a two-way mixed effects analysis of variance model, with raters as a fixed factor and agreement defined as absolute. Generally, values greater than .75 are considered “excellent”, values of .40-.75 are “fair-good”, and values below .40 are “poor” (Parkerson, Broadhead, & Tse, 1993). The results indicate that agreement for lifetime violence ratings ranged from “fair-good” to “excellent” (ICCs $> .72$; see Table 12).

Next, to assess the inter-rater reliability of the 11 goals for violence, ICCs were computed using a two-way mixed effects analysis of variance model, with raters as a fixed factor and agreement defined as absolute. The results indicate that agreement for the specific goals for violence ranged from “fair-good” to “excellent” (ICCs $> .67$; see Table 13).

Table 12
Inter-rater Reliability: AICS Ratings

Rating	ICC Value
Instrumental vs. Reactive	.81
Planning	.80
Goal-directedness	.75
Arousal	.73
Provocation	.78
Severity of Violence	.85
Relationship with victim	.93
Intoxication	.96
Psychosis	.96 ^a

^a One of the raters had no variability for ratings of psychosis; thus we calculated percent agreement instead and the two raters agreed 96% of the time.

Table 13
Inter-rater Reliability: Goals for Violence

Rating	ICC Value
Power	.74
Respect	.80
Material Gain	.85
Anger	.72
Fear	.68
No Apparent Motivation	.91
Substance Abuse	.77
Drug Dealing	.85
Gang Involvement	.94
Sensation Seeking Behavior	.99 ^a
Other Risky Behavior	.78

^a One of the raters had no variability for ratings of sensation seeking behavior; thus we calculated percent agreement instead and the two raters agreed 99% of the time.

Integration of Legal Records

A record review form (see Appendix V) was completed for participants who were still in an institution (prison, substance abuse site) at the time of recruitment. Record

reviews were completed to provide supplemental and integrated information about participants' violence. We recorded the number and type of past offenses, the police description of the current offense, and any institutional misbehavior that occurred during the follow-up period. When applicable, information contained in the participants' legal record was used to (1) obtain the most plausible account of violent incidents and (2) to obtain single ratings for both recent and lifetime violence that reflected all sources of information.

Training

One graduate student and six advanced undergraduate RAs assisted in the administration and the coding of the testing materials included in the proposed thesis. They received extensive training in clinical interviewing skills and administration of the assessment tools. This included nine hours of group instruction and role-playing and subsequent one-on-one training focused on the specific questions and needs of each interviewer. Each interviewer observed an advanced RA administer the complete protocol and was supervised during their first administration of the protocol.

Particular emphasis was placed on training RAs to reliably code the Recent Violence and Lifetime Violence interviews. RAs received didactic training and coding guides on the identification of violence (vs. other aggressive acts vs. non-violence), differentiation of individual violent incidents, elicitation of detail about each incident, and characterization of reactive vs. instrumental motivation for violence. Before beginning coding, all interviewers rated three practice vignettes, with feedback provided between each vignette to promote learning. Training continued throughout data collection, and weekly meeting time was dedicated to specific coding questions and difficulties. The

project coordinator also did “spot checks” to ensure adherence to coding rules and guidelines.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted in the two prisons, in the substance abuse facility, at local jails, at the university, or in the community. Interviews in the prisons, in the substance abuse facility, and at the university were conducted in private rooms. Community interviews were conducted in locations that would ensure the safety of interviewers, but that were also private enough to protect the confidentiality of participants (e.g., the library). When interviews were conducted in the community, RAs followed a protocol designed to protect their safety (see Monahan, Appelbaum, Mulvey, Robbins, & Lidz, 1993).

The study procedure involved three steps. First, RAs obtained participants’ written informed consent to participate in the study and written permission for the research team to review their institutional records and to access their data from the NIMH study. Once all appropriate consents were obtained, RAs conducted an interview with participants. The interview began with several measures not relevant to this thesis. After these measures had been administered and some rapport had developed, RAs administered the Recent Violence Interview and Lifetime Violence Interview. Then, RAs completed the record review. Each protocol took about 2-3 hours to complete and participants were provided breaks when necessary. Participants were paid \$20 for their participation and (when relevant) \$2 for travel reimbursement.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSES AND RESULTS

The analyses described below focused on the two overarching goals of this thesis: (1) clarifying the nature of the relation between the PCL-R psychopathy dimensions and the propensity and motivation for violence, and (2) examining subgroups of psychopathic individuals and their propensity and motivation for violence. The first goal was achieved via (a) a series of hierarchical logistic regression equations that focused on violence prediction, and (b) partial correlations that focused on lifetime motivation for violence. The second goal was achieved by dividing the sample into primary and secondary psychopathic groups (based on anxiety scores), and (a) using chi-square to test whether these groups differed in their likelihood for future violence, and (b) using independent sample t-tests to test whether these groups differed in their motivation for lifetime violence. These analyses are detailed below.

Psychopathy Dimensions and Violence

Recall that the first purpose of this thesis was to clarify the nature of the relationship between psychopathy and violence and is centered on the distinct dimensions of PCL-R psychopathy. Specifically, the analyses presented below focused on (1) determining the contribution of the core psychopathy traits to the prediction of future violence and

(2) exploring the relationship between each PCL-R dimension and motivation for violence committed over the lifetime. The analyses presented below address each issue.

Violence Prediction

The data analysis for the first, predictive aim was modeled after the analysis used by Skeem and Mulvey (2001) to determine whether their findings with civil psychiatric patients were replicable with a correctional sample. To address this aim, several steps were necessary. First, the bivariate relationships between scores on the PCL-R dimensions and violence that occurred during the follow-up period were assessed. Second, the incremental validity of the core psychopathic personality traits was examined after controlling for the effects of antisocial behavior, impulsivity, and hostility. Finally, the predictive validity of PCL-R psychopathy was explored by determining whether all of the psychopathy dimensions were necessary for maximal violence prediction. In the following paragraphs, these analyses will be described.

Bivariate Relationships Between the PCL-R and Violence

The bivariate relationships between PCL-R psychopathy (traditional two-factor model and the four PCL-R factors) and *any* (serious and minor acts of violence) follow-up violence were assessed using independent samples t-tests and eta (see Table 14). Using the traditional two-factor model and the four PCL-R factors (Cooke and Michie's (2001) three factors and Hare's (2003) fourth factor), individuals who became involved in any violence during the 90-day follow-up period were not significantly different from nonviolent individuals in terms of PCL-R scores. Overall, the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and violence was minimal.

Table 14

Bivariate Relationship Between PCL-R Psychopathy and Any Violence

PCL-R Scale	Violent		Non-Violent		<i>t</i> (181)	Eta
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Total Scores	25.56	7.84	24.29	7.35	0.90	.07
Two-Factor Model						
Emotional Detachment	10.26	4.61	9.37	4.38	1.07	.08
Antisocial Behavior	13.59	3.30	13.20	3.59	0.57	.04
Four PCL-R Factors						
Interpersonal	4.76	2.41	4.05	2.51	1.50	.11
Affective	5.50	2.53	5.32	2.43	0.40	.03
Lifestyle	6.59	1.94	6.46	1.97	0.34	.03
Criminality	6.88	2.24	6.78	2.41	0.22	.02

Note. None of the *t*-values in the table were statistically significant.

Given the practical importance of serious violence, the relationship between the PCL-R dimensions and serious follow-up violence was also examined. Participants who committed serious violence during the 90-day follow-up period had significantly higher antisocial behavior factor scores and interpersonal factor scores than those in the nonviolent group. However, the overall relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and serious violence was still relatively weak (see Table 15).

Table 15

Bivariate Relationship Between PCL-R Psychopathy and Serious Violence

PCL-R Scale	Violent		Non-Violent		<i>t</i> (181)	Eta
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Total Scores	27.53	6.79	24.26	7.45	1.78	.12
Two-Factor Model						
Emotional Detachment	11.27	4.01	9.38	4.43	1.73	.12
Antisocial Behavior	14.80	2.78	13.14	3.56	2.16*	.13
Four PCL-R Factors						
Interpersonal	5.33	2.16	4.08	2.51	2.12*	.14
Affective	5.93	2.15	5.30	2.46	1.08	.07
Lifestyle	7.27	1.94	6.42	1.95	1.62	.12
Criminality	7.27	2.19	6.76	2.39	0.85	.06

**p* < .05.

Given the relatively robust (if weak, $r = .26$) relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and future violence in extant literature, and the differences between prison inmates and substance abuse participants described in an earlier section, the data were explored for possible moderating effects of site.

PCL-R and Violence By Site

To determine whether site moderated the relationship between psychopathy and violence, a logistic regression equation was computed, and PCL-R total scores, site, and the interaction between PCL-R total scores and site were entered as the predictor variables. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), a statistically significant interaction term indicates moderation. The model fit poorly, $X^2(3, N = 183) = 2.518, p = .472$, and the interaction term was non-significant. Although these results suggest that site does not moderate the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and follow-up violence, the

power to detect moderation was likely limited by the small number of substance abuse participants ($n = 31$). Thus, to be cautious, the bivariate relationships between the PCL-R dimensions and violence that occurred during the follow-up period were explored separately for prison and substance abuse participants, using eta and partial correlations.

As shown in Table 16, for prison participants, PCL-R scores generally were unrelated to violence. In contrast, for substance abuse participants, once the shared variance among factors was controlled, the effect sizes of the emotional detachment and antisocial behavior factors, as well as the interpersonal factor, were comparable to effect sizes reported in the existing literature on the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and violence. Although these findings were not statistically significant, the small number of substance abuse participants ($n = 31$) limit power for these analyses.

Table 16
*Bivariate Relationship Between PCL-R Psychopathy and Violence for
Prison and Substance Abuse Participants*

PCL-R Scale	Site			
	Prison Inmates		Substance Abuse	
	Eta	Partial r	Eta	Partial r
Total scores	.10	-	.11	-
Two-Factor Model				
Emotional Detachment	.11	.11	.13	-.28
Antisocial Behavior	.03	-.02	.08	.26
Four PCL-R Factors				
Interpersonal	.17	.19*	.21	-.30
Affective	.03	-.10	.02	.17
Lifestyle	.06	-.01	.12	-.10
Criminality	.01	-.01	.08	.17

* $p < .05$.

Given qualitative differences between prison and substance abuse participants, the rest of the analyses presented here are conducted separately by site (substance abuse vs. prison). Moreover, given that violence was essentially unrelated to relevant PCL-R factors (e.g., antisocial behavior factor) among prison participants, analyses that assess (a) whether PCL-R features of emotional detachment (affective and lifestyle factors) add incremental utility to these PCL-R features of antisocial behavior, and (b) whether these two constellations of traits interact to predict violence, were conducted only for substance abuse participants.

Incremental Validity of the Core Traits of PCL-R Psychopathy

To determine whether the core traits of psychopathy predicted follow-up violence, the incremental validity of the core psychopathic traits was examined after controlling for the effects of antisocial behavior, impulsivity, and hostility. A series of hierarchical logistic regression equations were conducted to address this aim. For substance abuse participants, I conducted two hierarchical logistic regression equations with two steps, using the traditional two-factor model and then the four PCL-R factors to predict violence.

First, for the traditional two-factor model, the antisocial behavior factor was entered on the first step in order to control for the effects of criminal history, impulsivity, and hostility, and the emotional detachment factor was entered on the second step. Although the emotional detachment factor was not a significant predictor, comparison of the log-likelihood ratios for the model with and without the emotional detachment factor showed a trend toward the improvement of violence prediction, $X^2(1, N = 29) = 3.035, p = .08$.

Although not statistically significant, the emotional detachment factor was associated with a lower likelihood of future violence. The model summary is presented in Table 17.

Table 17
Logistic Model for Testing the Incremental Validity of Emotional Detachment PCL-R factor in Predicting Violence

Variable	Coefficient (β)	p
Antisocial Behavior	.40	.160
Emotional Detachment	-.41	.165

Next, I conducted a similar analysis, but focused on the four-factor model (Cooke and Michie's three factors (2001) plus Hare's (2003) fourth factor) to predict violence. On the first step, both the lifestyle and criminality factors were entered, and on the second step the interpersonal and affective factors were entered into the equation. Neither of the latter factors was a significant predictor of violence; however, both beta weights were moderate to large in size (interpersonal $\beta = -.59$; affective $\beta = .27$). Adding these two factors did not significantly improve model fit, $X^2(2, N = 29) = 2.814, p = .245$. The model summary is presented in Table 18.

Table 18
Logistic Model for Testing the Incremental Validity of the Interpersonal and Affective PCL-R Factors in Predicting Violence

Variable	Coefficient (β)	p
Lifestyle	-.20	.540
Criminality	.37	.346
Interpersonal	-.59	.124
Affective	.27	.526

Maximal Violence Prediction

Finally, the predictive validity of PCL-R psychopathy was examined by determining whether all the PCL-R dimensions were necessary for maximal violence prediction, after controlling for the main effects of each PCL-R dimension. A logistic hierarchical regression equation with two steps was computed for substance abuse participants. The Emotional Detachment factor (F1) and the Antisocial Behavior factor (F2) were entered on the first step to control for the main effects of these dimensions. The two-way interaction term was entered on the second step to determine whether the interaction term would significantly contribute to the prediction of violence.⁶

For substance abuse participants, the interaction term was not a significant predictor of violence ($\beta = .05, p = .17$). Comparison of the log-likelihood ratios for the model with and without the interaction term showed no significant improvement in the prediction of follow-up violence, $X^2(1, N = 29) = 2.167, p = .141$ (see Table 19 for the model summary).

Table 19
Maximal Violence Prediction

PCL-R scale	Coefficient (β)	<i>p</i>
Emotional Detachment	-1.16	.119
Antisocial Behavior	0.24	.521
F1 x F2	0.05	.168

Note. F1 x F2 = emotional detachment x antisocial behavior.

⁶ This analysis will only include the traditional two-factor model of PCL-R psychopathy, given that the purpose of this analysis is to determine whether the interaction of all the traits captured by PCL-R psychopathy are necessary for maximal violence prediction, and all the core traits of PCL-R psychopathy are captured by the traditional two-factor model.

In sum, PCL-R psychopathy generally did not predict violence in the entire sample, despite some weak links between the antisocial and interpersonal facets and future, serious violence. There were, however, theoretically meaningful differences by site. Although PCL-R scores generally were unrelated to violence in the large prison subsample, they related in the expected direction to violence in the small substance abuse subsample. Specifically, although these relationships were not statistically significant, those with high antisocial behavior scores were more likely to become involved in violence, whereas those with high emotional detachment scores were less likely to become involved in violence. At the subscale level, there were trends for the affective and criminality features to relate positively to future violence and for the interpersonal features to relate inversely to future violence. Notably, features of emotional detachment did not significantly contribute to the prediction of future violence, or interact with antisocial behavior to maximally predict violence.

Whereas the analyses presented thus far focus on the prediction of violence that occurred during the 90-day follow-up period, the analyses presented next focus on the motivation for the three most serious violent incidents that occurred during the participants' lifetime. Here I seek to determine whether PCL-R psychopathy is uniquely associated with particular reasons for committing violent behavior.

Motivation for Violence

The second aim of this thesis was to explore whether the dimensions of PCL-R psychopathy were uniquely associated with (1) particular motivation (instrumental vs. reactive rating) and characteristics for lifetime violence and (2) particular goals for

lifetime violence. To address this aim, the unique relationships between the different dimensions of PCL-R psychopathy and motivation goals for lifetime violence were explored.

PCL-R and Motivation for Violence By Site

Given the theoretically meaningful differences found between prison and substance abuse participants in violence prediction, the effect of site on the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and motivation for violence was explored as well. To determine whether site moderated the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and lifetime violence, a moderated multiple regression was conducted with PCL-R total scores, site, and the interaction between PCL-R total scores and site as predictors for motivation for lifetime violence (instrumental vs. reactive rating).

The interaction term was statistically non-significant ($p = .764$), indicating that site does not significantly moderate the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and lifetime violence (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Again, however, the small number of substance abuse participants ($n = 31$) likely limits the power of the moderator analysis. Thus, to be cautious, the relationships between PCL-R psychopathy and lifetime violence were explored separately for prison and substance abuse participants and will be presented separately.

Unique Relationships: PCL-R Psychopathy and Lifetime Violence

To explore the PCL-R factors' unique relationships with differing motivation for lifetime violence and goals for lifetime violence I calculated partial correlations between the psychopathy dimensions and scores on the lifetime violence ratings (motivation for lifetime violence and goals for lifetime violence). Partial correlations were used to

control for the shared variance among the psychopathy dimensions and were calculated separately for prison inmates and substance abuse participants for the traditional two-factor model and for the four PCL-R factors (Cooke and Michie's three factors and Hare's fourth factor).

For prison participants, contrary to what was expected, the antisocial behavior factor was significantly associated with lifetime violence characterized by instrumental motivation, with high levels of goal-directedness, and violence committed against strangers or acquaintances. In terms of the four PCL-R factors, the criminality factor accounted for the relation to instrumental motivation for violence, whereas the lifestyle factor related to high levels of intoxication and violence against less well-known victims. The emotional detachment factor was unrelated to motivation for violence; however, the interpersonal features had a small relationship with goal-directedness and the affective features were uniquely associated with less severe violence. Overall, the antisocial aspects of the PCL-R were uniquely associated with instrumental violence and related violence characteristics (see Table 20).

In terms of goals for lifetime violence, the antisocial behavior factor was positively associated with violence motivated by material gain (mostly through the lifestyle features) and negatively associated with violence motivated by anger. In addition, the criminality factor was significantly related to violence motivated by gang involvement. In contrast, the emotional detachment factor was negatively associated with violence motivated by fear, and the affective factor was negatively associated with violence motivated by material gain. The interpersonal features of PCL-R psychopathy were related to violence motivated by other risky behavior (e.g., getting involved in a bar

fight). Overall, the antisocial features of PCL-R psychopathy were related to instrumental goals for violence, whereas the core features were negatively related to fear and positively related to other risky behavior (see Table 20).

Table 20

Partial Correlations: The Unique Relationship Between PCL-R Psychopathy and Lifetime Motivation for Violence and Goals for Lifetime Violence (Prison Participants)

AICS Ratings	PCL-R Measure					
	Two-Factor Model		Four PCL-R Factors			
	ED	ASB	IP	A	LS	C
Lifetime Violence						
Instrumentality	.05	.21*	.15	-.09	.06	.19*
Planning	.03	.12	.10	-.05	-.02	.16
Goal-directedness	.04	.18*	.16*	-.13	.07	.16
Provocation	.00	-.10	.01	-.03	.01	-.15
Arousal	-.09	-.00	-.03	-.05	-.03	-.00
Severity of Violence	-.08	.13	.11	-.17*	.01	.16
Relationship	.07	-.20**	.02	.07	-.19*	-.09
Intoxication	-.09	.13	-.15	.02	.23**	-.05
Psychosis	-.09	.01	.01	-.07	-.08	.08
Goals for Violence						
Power	.10	-.01	.06	.06	-.08	.06
Respect	.08	.07	-.01	.09	.02	.04
Material Gain	-.14	.21**	.07	-.23**	.17	.11
Anger	-.03	-.19*	-.03	.01	-.10	-.14
Fear	-.22**	.04	-.16	-.06	.06	-.00
Substance Abuse	-.12	.04	-.11	-.02	.11	-.05
Drug Dealing	.12	.02	.09	.01	.05	-.02
Gang Involvement	.03	.16	.10	-.05	.00	.18*
Sensation Seeking	.05	.10	.11	-.08	.09	.04
Other Risky	.04	-.01	.17*	-.09	-.16	.13
None	.01	-.01	-.01	.00	.06	-.06

Note. ED = emotional detachment factor. ASB = antisocial behavior factor. IP = interpersonal factor. A = affective factor. LS = lifestyle factor. C = criminality factor.

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

For substance abuse participants, similar to prison participants, the features of PCL-R psychopathy associated with antisocial behavior and hostility (antisocial behavior factor) were related to lifetime violence characterized by instrumental motivation; however this relationship only approached significance. In contrast to expected results, the criminality factor was related to lower levels of provocation and arousal, whereas the core traits of PCL-R psychopathy (the emotional detachment factor) were related to high levels of provocation and arousal. Overall, the antisocial aspects of PCL-R psychopathy were related to instrumental motivation for violence and related characteristics (see Table 21).

In terms of goals for violence, the antisocial behavior was related to violence motivated by power; however this relationship only approached significance. The antisocial behavior factor (and the criminality factor) was also negatively related to violence motivated by anger and drug dealing whereas the lifestyle factor was only negatively related to anger. In contrast, the core features of PCL-R psychopathy were significantly negatively associated with violence motivated by power and were positively associated with drug dealing. Specifically, there was a trend for the interpersonal features to be negatively related to power and positively related to drug dealing (see Table 21). Overall, these findings contradict expectations, given that traits of hostility were negatively related to emotional, reactive violence, and traits of emotional detachment were positively related to high levels of emotional arousal.

Table 21

Partial Correlations: The Unique Relationship Between PCL-R Psychopathy and Lifetime Motivation for Violence and Goals for Lifetime Violence (Substance Abuse Participants)

AICS Ratings	PCL-R Measure					
	Two-Factor Model		Four PCL-R Factors			
	ED	ASB	IP	A	LS	C
Lifetime Violence						
Instrumentality	-.22	.36 ⁺	-.02	-.19	.21	.27
Planning	.29	.11	.01	.30	-.04	.20
Goal-directedness	-.18	.34 ⁺	.04	-.20	.13	.31
Provocation	.42*	-.51**	.25	.22	-.30	-.42 ⁺
Arousal	.40*	-.45*	.30	.13	-.32	-.58**
Severity of Violence	.22	-.17	.16	.09	-.08	-.10
Relationship	-.12	-.02	-.11	-.07	.07	-.24
Intoxication	.08	.19	-.17	.25	.19	.12
Psychosis	-.07	.32	-.10	.03	.25	.25
Goals for Violence						
Power	-.39*	.38 ⁺	-.39 ⁺	-.05	.35	.22
Respect	.14	-.19	.19	-.07	-.06	-.06
Material Gain	.18	.20	.18	.03	-.09	.38 ⁺
Anger	.24	-.40*	.27	.05	-.41*	-.43*
Fear ^a
Substance Abuse	.12	.00	-.04	.18	-.20	.17
Drug Dealing	.58**	-.55**	.46*	.19	-.22	-.60**
Gang Involvement	-.07	.00	-.07	-.02	-.12	.12
Sensation Seeking	-.11	.28	-.13	.00	.24	.20
Other Risky	-.20	.21	-.26	.07	.11	.31
None	-.05	.23	.11	-.19	.24	.15

Note. ED = emotional detachment factor. ASB = antisocial behavior factor. IP = interpersonal factor. A = affective factor. LS = lifestyle factor. C = criminality factor.

^a Partial correlations could not be computed for Fear because there was no variability.

** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$. ⁺ $p < .10$.

In sum, analyses involving the PCL-R and motivation for lifetime violence indicate that the antisocial aspects were most strongly tied to instrumental motivation for violence, for both prison and substance abuse participants. In terms of goals for lifetime violence, prison participants were qualitatively different from substance abuse participants. Specifically, the antisocial aspects of PCL-R psychopathy in prison participants were positively related to violence motivated by material gain and gang involvement and negatively related to violence motivated by anger. In contrast, the antisocial aspects of PCL-R psychopathy in substance abuse participants were positively related to violence motivated by power and negatively related to violence motivated by drug dealing. The results for the core features of PCL-R psychopathy and motivation for violence were contrary to expected results. Notably, results with prison participants are based on a much larger sample ($n = 158$) and are likely more stable and generalizable than findings with the small subsample of substance abuse participants ($n = 31$).

Overall, the analyses above were focused on determining whether the core dimensions of PCL-R psychopathy would uniquely predict future violence as well as exploring and describing unique relationships between psychopathy and motivation for lifetime violence. Whereas the previous section was focused on the PCL-R dimensions, the next section focuses on sub-groups of individuals with high PCL-R scores.

Psychopathy Subtypes and Violence

The second overarching purpose of this thesis was to examine subgroups of psychopathic individuals and their propensity and motivation for violence. These analyses are presented below.

Violence Prediction

Recall that the third aim of the proposed thesis was to determine whether secondary psychopaths or primary psychopaths are more likely to commit future violence. Given the small sample size for the substance abuse subsample ($n = 31$), this analysis was only conducted with prison participants. To address this aim, several steps were necessary. First, the prison sample was median split on the basis of PCL-R total scores (median = 25). There were 77 prison participants who received PCL-R total scores greater than 25; thus, 40.7% of the original sample was retained for this analysis. Next, this prison subgroup was median split on the basis of anxiety scores (median = 50) and these individuals⁷ were classified as primary psychopaths (low anxious; $n = 39$; 50.6%) and secondary psychopaths (high anxious; $n = 36$; 46.8%). To determine whether these two groups differed in terms of their likelihood for committing future violence, the primary psychopaths were compared to the secondary psychopaths, using a chi-square test. Contrary to my expectations, the chi-square test indicated that that there were no significant differences between the proportion of primary and secondary psychopaths that committed violence during the follow-up period $X^2(1, N = 75) = 0.788, p = .375, \phi = -.10, ns$.

Table 22
Frequency of Future Violence

Group	Violent	Non-Violent	Total
Primary Psychopaths	11	28	39
Secondary Psychopaths	7	29	36
Total	18	57	75

⁷ Two of these individuals could not be classified due to missing PCL-R scores.

Motivation for Violence

The fourth aim of this thesis was to examine whether primary (low anxious) psychopaths would differ from secondary (high anxious) psychopaths in terms of their motivation for violence. To address this aim, independent samples t-tests were conducted.

First, the primary psychopaths were compared to the secondary psychopaths in terms of motivation for lifetime violence. Secondary psychopaths were significantly more likely to commit violence characterized by instrumental motivation than the primary psychopaths. There was also a trend for secondary psychopaths to commit lifetime violence that was more goal-directed (see Table 23).

Table 23
Primary vs. Secondary Psychopaths and Lifetime Motivation for Violence

Lifetime Violence	Primary		Secondary		<i>t</i> (86)	Eta
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Instrumental vs. Reactive	1.77	0.73	2.13	0.83	-2.03*	.23
Planning	1.32	0.55	1.38	0.44	-0.43	.05
Goal-directedness	1.78	0.74	2.08	0.82	-1.69 ⁺	.20
Provocation	2.71	0.75	2.62	0.64	0.58	.07
Arousal	2.53	0.56	2.40	0.49	1.04	.12
Severity of Violence	3.10	0.70	3.08	0.56	0.13	.02
Victim Relationship	2.45	0.85	2.44	0.98	0.06	.01
Intoxication	1.71	0.62	1.77	0.67	-0.40	.05
Psychosis	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	.00

* $p < .05$. ⁺ $p < .10$.

Second, the primary psychopaths were compared to the secondary psychopaths in terms of goals for lifetime violence. Secondary psychopaths were significantly more likely than primary psychopaths to commit violence motivated by gang involvement, and

there was a trend for secondary psychopaths to be more likely to commit violence motivated by substance abuse and material gain. Interestingly, there was a trend for primary psychopaths to be more likely to commit violence motivated by anger and violence with no apparent motivation, or motivation that it is difficult for the reasonable person to understand (see Table 24).

Table 24
Primary vs. Secondary Psychopaths and Goals for Lifetime Violence

Goals for Violence	Primary		Secondary		<i>t</i> (86)	Eta
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Power	1.38	0.55	1.44	0.66	-0.49	.06
Respect	2.21	1.02	2.27	0.96	-0.28	.03
Material Gain	1.24	0.46	1.46	0.61	-1.76 ⁺	.20
Anger	2.09	0.99	1.73	0.78	1.75 ⁺	.20
Fear	1.05	0.20	1.01	0.06	1.24	.14
Substance Abuse	1.00	0.00	1.06	0.19	-1.86 ⁺	.21
Drug Dealing	1.20	0.44	1.38	0.52	-1.61	.19
Gang Involvement	1.18	0.41	1.56	0.77	-2.67**	.30
Sensation Seeking	1.03	0.17	1.08	0.26	-0.99	.12
Other Risky Behavior	1.18	0.46	1.23	0.46	-0.53	.06
None	1.09	0.31	1.00	0.00	1.85 ⁺	.21

** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$. ⁺ $p < .10$.

Subtypes vs. Dimensions

Given parallels between the PCL-R dimensions (e.g., antisocial behavior factor) and subtypes (e.g., secondary) in their pattern of relations with motivation and goals for violence, independent samples *t* tests were conducted to determine whether the primary and secondary groups differed in their scores on the PCL-R dimensions. The primary psychopaths were significantly different from the secondary psychopaths in terms of antisocial behavior factor scores. Specifically, the secondary psychopaths obtained

significantly higher scores on the antisocial behavior factor than the primary psychopaths. There were no other significant differences in terms of PCL-R scores (see Table 25). The results with PCL-R dimensions and psychopathy subtypes taken together suggest that scores on the PCL-R dimensions might have impacted results with primary and secondary subtypes. Specifically, secondary subtypes may have had a stronger tendency to commit instrumental violence *because* of their higher scores on the antisocial behavior factor.

In sum, the analyses above indicate that primary vs. secondary psychopaths did not differ in their propensity to commit future violence. However, these analyses did indicate that secondary psychopaths were more likely to commit violence characterized by instrumental motivation. Higher antisocial behavior factor scores in the secondary psychopaths may be related to their slightly higher tendency to commit instrumental violence.

Table 25
Primary vs. Secondary Psychopaths and PCL-R Scores

PCL-R Scale	Primary		Secondary		<i>t</i> (73)
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Total Scores	30.49	2.87	31.19	2.87	-1.06
Two-Factor Model					
Emotional Detachment	13.13	2.64	12.50	2.27	1.10
Antisocial Behavior	15.03	2.42	16.25	1.70	-2.52*
Four PCL-R Factors					
Interpersonal	5.90	1.96	5.36	2.05	1.16
Affective	7.23	1.20	7.14	0.87	0.38
Lifestyle	7.33	1.51	7.94	1.12	-1.98 ⁺
Criminality	7.69	1.92	8.31	1.35	-1.59

* $p < .05$. ⁺ $p < .10$.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This thesis was designed to (1) determine the extent to which the core traits of PCL-R psychopathy were uniquely related to the propensity and motivation for violence in a criminal sample and (2) explore whether subgroups of psychopaths differed in their propensity and motivation for violence. The primary results of this thesis can be summarized in three points. First, PCL-R psychopathy did not predict future violence for prison participants but was a small, if not statistically significant, predictor of future violence for substance abuse participants. Second, the antisocial aspects of PCL-R psychopathy were uniquely related to instrumental motivation for violence, whereas the core psychopathy traits were largely unrelated to motivation for violence. Finally, there were no significant differences between primary and secondary psychopaths in terms of the frequency of future violence; however, secondary psychopaths were more likely to commit instrumental violence. Generally, these findings contradict common notions regarding PCL-R psychopathy and its relation to violence. In this section, the primary findings of this thesis, its limitations, and its implications for practice and research are presented.

Primary Findings

PCL-R Psychopathy and Violence Prediction

The first primary finding of this thesis was that PCL-R psychopathy was not a predictor of future violence for prison participants but was a small, though non-significant, predictor of future violence for substance abuse participants. Findings with prison participants contradict extant research on the basic relationship between psychopathy and community violence, but replicate research with regard to PCL-R psychopathy and institutional violence (Guy, Edens, Anthony, & Douglas, 2005). Findings with substance abuse participants generally replicate research on the basic relationship between psychopathy and community violence. Results for prison participants will be discussed first, followed by a discussion of results for substance abuse participants.

PCL-R psychopathy did not predict violence for prison participants. This study failed to replicate previous research findings regarding the general relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and future violence for prison participants and contradicts my expectations regarding the relationship between psychopathy and violence. Overall, the literature suggests that the antisocial behavior factor of PCL-R psychopathy reliably predicts future violence (average effect size = .22-.26; Walters, 2003), whereas the emotional detachment factor has a relatively weak relationship with future violence (average effect size = .12-.18; Walters, 2003). Along these lines, I predicted that the antisocial behavior (and similar factors in the four-factor model) would be significantly related to future violence, and that the emotional detachment factor would have little to no relationship with future violence. In particular, findings with prison participants contradict previous

literature with regard to the antisocial behavior factor. Therefore, the following discussion will revolve around the antisocial behavior factor, rather than PCL-R total scores or the emotional detachment factor.

Although findings with prison participants contradict the idea that the antisocial behavior factor of PCL-R psychopathy and future violence are reliably related, there is research that indicates this is not *always* the case. Along these lines, Edens (2006) noted that, “the ‘average’ association between psychopathy and violence in these meta-analyses belies the fact that across studies the strength of this relationship is remarkably heterogeneous” (p. 60). Although in the most recent and comprehensive meta-analysis of the relation between psychopathy and violence prediction, analyses indicated an average effect size of .26 between the antisocial behavior factor and future violence (Walters, 2003), these studies were significantly heterogeneous. To overcome this limitation, Walters (2003) identified 12 of the most methodologically sound studies, which included full PCL or PCL-R interviews, adult samples, and at least a one-year follow-up period, and found that these studies were homogeneous (based on a test of homogeneity).

A closer look at the most methodologically sound studies in the Walters (2003) meta-analysis indicates that only five of them included violent outcomes (Buffington, Edens, Johnson, & Johnson, 2002; Glover, Nicholson, Hemmati, Bernfeld, & Quinsey, 2002; Kroner & Loza, 2001; Serin, 1996; Walters, Duncan, & Geyer, 2003). The relationship between the antisocial behavior factor and violence in these studies was small, with effect sizes ranging from .08 to .22. Of the remaining 30 heterogeneous, less methodologically sound studies, effect sizes between the antisocial behavior factor and future violence ranged from -.05 to .54, with 13 of these effect sizes falling below .20. Notably, the

largest effect sizes for the antisocial behavior factor were found in studies that are methodologically questionable, including a study of 80 high school students (Ridenour, Marchant, & Dean, 2001; $r = .54$) and a study of 58 juvenile offenders (Hicks, Rogers, & Cashel, 2000; $r = .49$). This literature, taken together, suggests that global statements regarding the relationship between the PCL-R antisocial behavior factor and future violence may be inappropriate.

There are several possible explanations for the finding that the antisocial behavior factor did not predict violence in this sample of prison participants. First, there may have been restriction of range in the prison sample resulting in a weaker relationship between the antisocial behavior factor and violence. That is, if the prison participants all had high levels of criminality, then criminality in this sample would not do a good job of predicting violence. In fact, there is some indirect evidence to suggest that the use of samples with arguably lower levels of criminality result in a stronger relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and violence. For example, of the studies included in Walter's (2003) meta-analysis of the relationship between the PCL-R and violence, most of the studies with the strongest association (effect sizes $> .30$) between PCL-R psychopathy and aggressive/violent outcomes were conducted with psychiatric/forensic patients (six studies), community offenders (one study), juveniles or young offenders (three studies), and federal prison inmates (one study).

Similarly, although there are not large differences between PCL-R normative data and the distribution of PCL-R scores in this sample, prison participants did obtain scores on the antisocial behavior factor that were both negatively skewed and significantly higher

than normative data reported in the PCL-R manual (Hare, 1991, 2003), $t(153) = 6.65, p < .01$.

A second potential explanation for smaller effect sizes for the antisocial behavior factor in this study relates to its relatively short follow-up period (90 days). Specifically, most prison participants were still incarcerated at the time of the follow-up; thus, it may be that prison participants had less of an opportunity to commit violence in a restricted environment. However, in the larger NIMH study from which this sample was drawn, the antisocial behavior factor was still weakly related to future violence ($\eta^2 = .14$), even with a follow-up period of one year after release.

A third potential explanation for the weak relation between the antisocial behavior factor and future violence in this sample of prison participants is that most of the violence (83.9%) identified in this study occurred in an institution. Recent research is consistent with the notion that PCL-R psychopathy is a poor predictor of institutional violence (Guy et al., 2005). Specifically, Guy et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis examining the relationship between the PCL measures and institutional misconduct. Consistent with the results in this subsample of prison inmates, they found that the relationship between institutional violence and the antisocial behavior factor (as well as total scores and emotional detachment factor scores) was weak ($r_w = .15, k = 16$; Guy et al., 2005).

Although the relationship between the antisocial behavior factor and future violence in the current subsample of prison participants was weak, findings with substance abuse are more consistent with the common notion that the antisocial behavior factor is related to future violence, perhaps because the substance abuse participants were in a less

restrictive environment and had more opportunity to engage in violent behavior. These results are discussed next.

PCL-R psychopathy in substance abuse participants. The relationship between the PCL-R antisocial behavior factor and future violence in substance abuse participants (partial $r = .26$) was consistent with the average effect size of .26 reported in the extant literature (Salekin et al., 1996; Hemphill et al., 1998; Walters, 2003). Moreover, higher scores on the antisocial behavior factor were related to a higher propensity for committing future violence (partial $r = .26$), whereas higher scores on the emotional detachment factor were related to a *lower* likelihood of committing violence (partial $r = -.28$).

Similarly, analyses with the four PCL-R factors further revealed that higher levels of the interpersonal PCL-R features resulted in a lower likelihood of committing violence (partial $r = -.30$), whereas higher levels of the affective PCL-R features resulted in a higher likelihood (partial $r = .17$) of committing future violence. Although the core PCL-R traits did not add significantly to the prediction of violence, there was trend ($p < .10$) toward improvement of prediction (in the negative direction) with the addition of the emotional detachment traits after controlling for the antisocial behavior factor.

Despite the fact that findings with this substance abuse subsample are limited by very small sample sizes and statistically non-significant results, the results do raise overall questions about current academic discourse involving psychopathic traits of emotional detachment. Specifically, it is a widely held assumption that the core traits of psychopathy have negative consequences for society (e.g., crime, violence); however it

may be that the core interpersonal traits of psychopathy at times “protect” against crime and violence, rather than causing crime and violence.

Indeed, Patrick et al. (1997) postulated that high levels of psychopathic traits of emotional detachment might help individuals avoid legal trouble, in particular, violence. The relationship between the PCL-R factors and positive/negative emotionality lends support to this hypothesis. Recall that the emotional detachment factor is positively related to positive emotionality, whereas the antisocial behavior factor is related to negative emotionality (Hall, Benning, & Patrick, 2004). Given that violence is most commonly committed out of emotions such as anger and frustration (Berkowitz, 1993), it makes sense that a high level of positive emotions and lower levels of negative emotions would “protect” against violent behavior. The current findings with substance abuse participants provide some small support for the notion that traits of emotional detachment may protect against the propensity to commit violence, rather than result in violence.

In sum, the first overarching goal of this thesis was to determine whether the core PCL-R features were uniquely related to future violence and motivation for violence. In terms of future violence, there was no relationship between PCL-R psychopathy (both antisocial behavior and emotional detachment) and future violence for prison participants, and a small, though non-significant, unique relationship between the core features of PCL-R psychopathy and future violence for substance abuse participants. The relationship between the antisocial behavior factor and future violence in prison participants was consistent with literature that specifically examines the relationship between the PCL-R and institutional violence. Findings with substance abuse participants, although limited, were consistent with the existing literature, which might be

due to the fact that they were in a less restrictive environment and had more opportunity to commit community violence. Primary findings involving the relationship between the core traits of PCL-R psychopathy and motivation for violence are discussed next.

PCL-R Psychopathy and Motivation for Violence

The second primary finding of this thesis was that, for both prison and substance abuse participants, the antisocial behavior factor (the lifestyle features and criminal history) of PCL-R psychopathy was uniquely related to instrumental motivation for violence, whereas the affective and interpersonal traits of PCL-R psychopathy were largely unrelated to motivation for violence⁸. This relationship was strongest for the criminality factor of PCL-R psychopathy, indicating that instrumental motivation for violence in this sample was related to criminal history. This thesis went a step further than prior research, going beyond instrumental vs. reactive violence to examine the specific goals of violence. The results indicate that the antisocial behavior factor (particularly its lifestyle features) related to violence committed for material gain.

Together, these findings contradict the intuitive notion that individuals who are callous, unemotional, and egocentric would commit cold-blooded, calculated violence for their own personal gain. They also contradict research indicating that there is a small association between the core PCL-R features and instrumental motivation for violence. In the first examination of this relationship, Cornell et al. (1996) conducted two studies. In the first, the authors found that only the antisocial behavior factor was related to

⁸ Contrary to expectations, for substance abuse participants, the emotional detachment factor was uniquely related to violence characteristics that would typically be associated with reactive motivation for violence (e.g., high levels of provocation and arousal). A closer examination of this data revealed that these relationships were unstable and almost wholly attributable to the influence of two outlying participants. Given the small number of participants included in the substance abuse subsample, we limit the remainder of this discussion to findings with the larger sample of prison participants.

instrumental violence, whereas in the second study they found that both aspects of PCL-R psychopathy (emotional detachment and antisocial behavior) were significantly related to instrumental violence (Cornell et al., 1996). In contrast, Hart and Dempster (1997) reported that the emotional detachment factor was uniquely tied to instrumental violence (partial $r = .26$), whereas the antisocial behavior factor was unrelated to instrumental violence (partial $r = .11$)⁹. Additionally, with a sample of federal prison inmates ($n = 125$) convicted for homicide, Woodworth and Porter (2002) found that the emotional detachment factor was uniquely associated with homicides characterized by instrumental motivation (partial $r = .37$)¹⁰, whereas the antisocial behavior factor was unrelated to instrumental motivation (partial $r = .09$).

Differences between the results of this thesis and previous research could be due to differences in methodology. For example, all three prior studies rated motivation for violence from institutional records, and two rated the PCL-R solely from institutional records (Cornell et al., 1996; Hart & Dempster, 1997). In the present thesis, motivation for violence ratings were based on richer information obtained from intensive, face-to-face, qualitative interviews with participants as well as collateral reports included in record reviews. In our experience, it is difficult to glean motivation for violence entirely from legal records, which often lack the details necessary to make accurate ratings. It is also difficult to rate some of the interpersonal and affective features of PCL-R psychopathy accurately without some interaction with an individual.

⁹ It should be noted that this data has never been published in a peer-reviewed journal, but was presented at an APA conference in 1996.

¹⁰ Instrumental homicide in this study was defined largely by planning and included “goals” of revenge and retribution. These ratings are substantially different from the ratings made in this thesis, where instrumental violence was not equated with planning or particular goals, but was an overall rating based on participant description of the entire violent incident and rater judgments based on descriptions of instrumental vs. reactive motivation for violence.

It may genuinely be the case that core traits of psychopathy relate to instrumental violence less strongly than antisocial behavior. First, individuals with interpersonal and affective features of psychopathy may resort to manipulative tactics, superficial charm, and deceit rather than violence to obtain what they desire. Although this has never directly been examined, there is evidence to suggest that at least the interpersonal features of PCL-R psychopathy relate to an ability to control and influence others (partial $r = .34$; Hall, Benning & Patrick, 2004). It may also be that individuals with a criminal lifestyle may often resort to instrumental violence, or that criminal behavior relates to instrumental violence. Research indicates that instrumental violence is related to involvement in other crimes. For example, Pulkinnen (1987) found that instrumental violence in youth is predictive of criminality at a later age. Although some have attributed this link to psychopathy (Cornell, et al., 1996), it may be attributable to social disadvantage.

Indeed, several criminological theories suggest that social disadvantage results in antisocial behavior intended to obtain goals that are otherwise unachievable through standard, socially acceptable means (Williams & McShane, 1999). For example, Merton's anomie theory suggests that the emphasis of financial success and the unequal distribution of resources in the United States results in individuals who wish to obtain money and success, but lack the means and thus develop other means of achieving wealth and power (e.g., stealing; Williams & McShane, 1999). This theory is consistent with the finding in this thesis that criminal history was related to instrumental violence committed for material gain. For instance, an individual might commit robbery to obtain money to

increase his social status, but participation in a robbery might also lead to violent behavior that would be characterized as instrumental¹¹.

There is indirect evidence to support the notion that crime, social disadvantage, and instrumental violence are inter-related. For example, criminological research suggests that violence overall is related to long criminal histories mostly consisting of nonviolent crime (Miethe & McCorkle, 2001). Perhaps individuals who commit many crimes also end up committing violence with instrumental goals. Indeed, according to Uniform Crime Report data, one of the most common motivations for murder involves participation in robberies (Miethe & McCorkle, 2001). Further, violence is most likely to take place in low-income neighborhoods, further implicating the role of social disadvantage in the motivation for violent behavior, as these authors note:

Cities and neighborhoods with high unemployment, rapid population turnover, overcrowding and housing decay, high ethnic diversity, substandard schools, high rates of single-parent households, and high income inequality have the highest rates of homicide and assault (Miethe & McCorkle, 2001, p. 23-24).

It is likely that crimes and instrumental violence are the products of a combination of factors (e.g., personality, social learning, social disadvantage, and criminal values).

According to some theorists, individuals with certain temperaments and high levels on personality dimensions such as neuroticism and extroversion (Eysenck & Gudjonsson,

¹¹ Other theories of criminality pose that social disorganization and inequality result in the development of a set of subcultural values that involve endorsement of criminal behavior to obtain what is otherwise unattainable (Williams & McShane, 1999). For example, strain theory poses that isolation from the rest of society results in the rejection of traditional social values and the acquisition of values consistent with a criminal lifestyle (Williams & McShane). This theory might relate to the finding in this thesis that criminal history was related to instrumental motivation for violence that accompanied gang involvement. For example, an individual might commit an instrumentally violent act in order to maintain his status as a member of a gang.

1989) develop into criminals who at times may commit instrumental violence. These individuals might also be socially disadvantaged and endorse values consistent with criminality. This is consistent with Lykken's (1995) theory of criminality, which poses that criminality results from an interaction of biological and environmental factors that result in individuals driven by various motivational forces. Many individuals' violence may reflect both traits of impulsivity and hostility and the nature of a particular situation.

Psychopathy Subgroups

The third primary finding of this thesis was that for prison participants, there were no significant differences between primary and secondary psychopaths in terms of violence prediction; however, secondary psychopaths were more likely to commit instrumental violence. Both of these findings are inconsistent with existing theories regarding psychopathy subtypes and will be discussed below.

Although "secondary" psychopathy (high anxiety psychopaths) has been linked with more frequent violence, the results of this thesis fail to support this assertion. Instead, the findings of this thesis indicate that there are no differences between primary and secondary psychopaths in terms of their propensity for committing future violence. Although to date very few research studies have attempted to identify more homogenous subgroups of psychopathic individuals, the findings in this thesis are inconsistent with those that exist. Specifically, the results in this thesis are inconsistent with a study conducted by Hicks et al. (2004), which suggested that high anxious psychopaths were more likely to be aggressive. Hicks et al. (2004) identified two groups of psychopathic individuals, one group that was emotionally stable (primary) and another that was aggressive, anxious and hostile (secondary). The secondary group in the Hicks et al.

(2004) study was more likely to be violent. In addition, Skeem et al. (in press) identified primary and secondary subtypes similar to those identified by Hicks et al. (2004). Taken together, these findings provide support for the notion that psychopathic subtypes differ on several theoretically important variables. Notably, these authors (Hicks et al., 2004; Skeem et al., in press) used several clustering variables to identify psychopathic subtypes, whereas only anxiety was used in this thesis, and used cluster analysis techniques recommended for identifying psychopathy subtypes (Poythress & Skeem, 2006).

There are several other possible explanations for the inconsistencies between this thesis and previous research. First, most of the prison participants were still incarcerated at the 90-day follow-up period, which may have decreased the opportunity for engaging in violence compared to the opportunity for violence in the community. Second, and along the same lines, perhaps individuals with high levels of trait anxiety would be less likely to commit violence in an institution, due to anxiety about being caught or being imprisoned for longer periods of time. Finally, it is possible that self-reported trait anxiety did not distinguish well between primary and secondary subtypes in this sample, despite evidence in other studies (Skeem et al., in press) that trait anxiety differentiated well between primary and secondary subtypes.

Although several researchers have theorized that “primary” psychopathy is linked with a propensity for engaging in instrumental violence (Patrick & Zempolich, 1998; Skeem et al., 2003), the results of this thesis suggest that the secondary psychopaths were more likely to commit violence characterized by instrumental motivation. Although this finding is inconsistent with seminal descriptions of psychopathy subtypes (Karpman, 1941), this finding may be related to the fact that secondary psychopaths obtained high

scores on the antisocial behavior factor. Perhaps secondary psychopaths in this sample consisted of individuals with long criminal histories who also have a tendency to become violent during the commission of an instrumental crime. Indeed, secondary psychopathy was also significantly related to violence motivated by gang involvement ($\eta = .30$) and there was a trend for these individuals to commit violence motivated by material gain and substance abuse.

In sum, this thesis suggests that there are no differences between primary and secondary psychopaths in terms of future violence prediction; however secondary psychopaths were more likely to commit violence characterized by instrumental motivation. It should be noted that findings in this thesis involving “subtypes” are limited by small sample sizes and the use of only one variable to create more homogenous subgroups of psychopathic individuals. In addition, it is notable that the NIMH study, which was a study designed to identify psychopathic subtypes using clustering techniques and a number of theoretically relevant variables, identified five different psychopathy subtypes. The NIMH study analyses also revealed that trait anxiety did not differentiate very well between the subtypes.

Limitations

This study had notable limitations comparable to limitations inherent in any research study. First, small sample sizes likely limited the power of several of the analyses reported in this thesis. In particular, there were only 31 substance abuse participants recruited and retained in this study. Although results for violence prediction in this sample of substance abuse participants were theoretically coherent and meaningful, these

results were non-significant and are possibly due to random error. Further, these results may not be generalizable to the population. In addition, the fact that smaller numbers of substance abuse participants were retained in the study may have resulted in sample bias. Specifically, individuals at the substance abuse site who were not retained in this sample may have been more transient or at greater risk for future violence. Finally, the size of both the prison and substance abuse subsamples limited the findings involving subtypes and their propensity and motivation for violence.

Second, the 90-day follow-up period used in this study is shorter than that of follow-up periods used in other studies intended to examine the relationship between psychopathy and violence; however this study did include more sensitive and detailed measures of violence. The fact that most follow-up violence occurred in an institution likely impacted the relationship between psychopathy and violence reported in this thesis (Guy et al., 2005) resulting in less of an opportunity to commit violence while incarcerated.

Finally, the PCL-R assessment of psychopathy may have limited the results of this thesis. Although the PCL-R is the current “gold standard” for measuring psychopathy, this measure inherently confounds the classic construct of psychopathy with antisocial, criminal behavior. Although some investigators accept this model and assert that emotional detachment and antisocial behavior are both important aspects of psychopathic personality, recent criticisms of the PCL-R suggest that this is inconsistent with theoretical underpinnings of psychopathy and common conceptions of the construct (Cooke & Michie, 2001; Skeem & Cooke, in press; Lilienfeld, 1994). Although the statistical analyses in this thesis attempted to disaggregate the construct of psychopathy

from antisocial behavior by controlling for the shared variance among the PCL-R factors, the two constructs are still confounded. For example, it may be that ratings of criminal behavior bias ratings of the core personality traits measured in the PCL-R. In fact, most individuals included in this thesis had both high scores on emotional detachment and antisocial behavior, and very few had high scores on the emotional detachment factor alone. This suggests that either (1) there weren't very many "emotionally detached" individuals included in this sample or (2) true psychopathy cannot truly be separated from antisocial behavior when using the PCL-R. It seems likely that the findings of this thesis involving psychopathic personality traits are limited by the inclusion of counts of antisocial behavior in the PCL-R.

Implications for Practice

The findings in this study are directly relevant to practical uses of the PCL-R in legal settings, given that the PCL-R is most often used in the legal system to predict dangerousness (DeMatteo & Edens, 2006; Walsh & Walsh, 2006). For example, two recent reviews of the use of the PCL-R in the legal system suggest that its use has increased substantially and that it is most often used to predict dangerousness when making sentencing decisions, release decisions, and in rare cases, death penalty decisions (DeMatteo, & Edens, 2006; Walsh & Walsh, 2006). Recall that this is largely due to the "reliable" finding in the literature that PCL-R psychopathy is the single best predictor of future violence (Hemphill et al., 1998; Salekin, 1996; Walters, 2003). This is perhaps an overzealous and oversimplified statement, particularly when applied to individual offenders. The results of this thesis contribute to a growing body of literature that

suggests that the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and violence is more complex in terms of heterogeneity across samples (Edens, 2006; Walters, 2003), the context (e.g., prison, psychiatric inpatient, community) and purpose (e.g., death penalty, release, security level) of the assessment (DeMatteo & Edens, 2006; Edens, 2006; Guy et al., 2005), and important differences between the different aspects of PCL-R psychopathy (Cooke & Michie, 2001; Skeem & Cooke, in press).

Overall, the findings of this thesis suggest that overarching statements such as the assertion that psychopathy is an “unparalleled” measure of risk for future violence (Salekin et al., 1996; Gendreau, et al., 2002) may not be warranted. According to Edens (2006), recent research with the PCL-R implies that “one should not discuss the ‘global’ relationship between psychopathy and violence but, instead, should consider other factors (e.g., context) that might help practitioners and researchers better understand why such variability exists across different populations and settings” (p. 60-61).

In particular, the findings in this thesis bear directly on the use of the PCL-R measure to predict institutional violence. This subsample of prison participants were generally incarcerated at the time of the follow-up and committed institutional violence; however, PCL-R psychopathy had no relationship with future violence in prison participants. Despite earlier research findings that the PCL-R was not a strong predictor of institutional violence, PCL-R psychopathy has already been used in legal cases to determine dangerousness in prison settings, and was used in one particular death penalty case (DeMatteo & Edens, 2006). The results of this thesis and other extant research suggest that the use of the PCL-R to predict institutional violence does not meet the legal

standards required for the introduction of evidence into court, and may even be an ethical violation of the APA ethics code and the forensic guidelines.

Additionally, this thesis raises questions about the relationship between psychopathy *per se* and future violence. Overall, research suggests that the relationship between the core interpersonal and affective traits of PCL-R psychopathy and violence is weak (DeMatteo & Edens, 2006; Skeem & Mulvey, 2001; Walters, 2003); however the common assumption is that an individual with high scores on the affective and interpersonal factors of PCL-R psychopathy is inherently violent. The findings of this thesis do not support this assertion. In practice, this suggests that it is inappropriate for examiners to equate dangerousness with the core traits of psychopathy, given that this could bias legal players.

Finally, the results of this thesis call into question the validity of assertions that have been made about the relationship between the core traits of psychopathy and instrumental violence. Specifically, several researchers have made the assertion that psychopaths are violent predators that commit serious, cold-blooded, calculating violence. Assertions like these may also lead to possibly incorrect, prejudicial views held by legal players and may inappropriately bias important legal decisions. Although it has been asserted with a high degree of certainty that psychopathy is related to instrumental violence in several peer-reviewed journal articles, very little systematic research has been conducted to directly examine this issue, and extant research is inconsistent with regard to this relationship.

Implications for Research

The results of this thesis also have clear implications for research. As mentioned earlier, other measures of psychopathy may be useful in more clearly defining the pure relationship between the core traits of psychopathy and propensity and motivation for violence. It may be that research based on the PCL-R measure is confounded by the inclusion of counts of antisocial behavior. There are new, “cleaner” measures of psychopathy, such as the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996; Lilienfeld & Widows, 2006), that do not confound the classic construct of psychopathy with antisocial behavior. Perhaps exploration with newer and cleaner measures of psychopathy will serve to clarify the relationship between the core traits of psychopathy and violence.

In addition, the results of this thesis suggest that future research that seeks to examine the relationship between PCL-R psychopathy and violence should be focused on particular kinds of violence (official recidivism vs. self-reported violence vs. institutional violence) that occurs in particular contexts (prison vs. treatment settings vs. forensic psychiatric hospitals vs. community). This may help to prevent overgeneralizations regarding the relationship between psychopathy and violence. The current large body of literature represents many different outcome measures, samples, follow-up periods, and so forth. Because findings in the literature on PCL-R psychopathy and violence are largely heterogeneous, it is important for future research to make specific conclusions about the generalizability and replicability of findings.

It also seems important for future research to continue to examine the relationship between psychopathy and motivation for violence and to identify more homogenous

groups of psychopathic subtypes. The findings in this thesis were overall inconsistent with the notion that “different psychopathies” result in different kinds of violence, but this finding contradicts previous literature that directly examines this issue. Future research that identifies psychopathy subtypes on the basis of several theoretically important variables and recommended clustering techniques may serve to clarify inconsistencies regarding the relationship between psychopathy and motivation for violence.

Finally, it seems clear that criminological and sociological literature could help inform future research regarding the relationship between psychopathy and violence as well as more general theories of personality and their relation to crime and violence (Eysenck & Gudjonsson, 1989). Specifically, these theories seem particularly important to understanding the link between the antisocial behavior factor and instrumental motivation for violence. For example, it may be that the antisocial behavior factor captures general personality traits, such as extraversion and neuroticism that predispose an individual toward a criminal lifestyle that includes instrumental crime and violence. In addition, it might be useful for future research on psychopathy and violence prediction to incorporate important variables, such as low socioeconomic status and other variables related to social disadvantage.

APPENDIX I

RECENT VIOLENCE INTERVIEW

AN IMPORTANT PART OF OUR RESEARCH IS TO SEE HOW OFTEN PEOPLE HAVE PROBLEMS WITH ONE ANOTHER. WE KNOW THAT MANY OF THESE DISPUTES AREN'T OUT OF THE ORDINARY FOR MANY PEOPLE. I AM GOING TO READ YOU SEVERAL TYPES OF PROBLEMS THAT HAPPEN IN SOME PEOPLE'S LIVES. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL US HOW OFTEN THEY HAVE HAPPENED IN YOUR LIFE IN THE THREE MONTHS SINCE YOU SAW THE ORIGINAL RESEARCHERS, THAT IS BETWEEN (*original interview date*) AND (*target date*). YOU MAY NEED TO SPEND SOME TIME TO THINK BACK TO WHEN THEY HAVE OCCURRED. TAKE AS MUCH TIME AS YOU NEED.

[INTERVIEWER: Ask the S to indicate Y/N for questions 1-19 first. Then, for each Yes response to items about S's violence, ask for the # of times. Determine how many separate incidents occurred over the past three months, based on differences in times, places or victims. For each incident, code only the most serious violence (highest question number): erase less serious violence that occurred within each incident. Once counts are complete, ask the probe questions on the following page for the five most serious incidents.]

IN THE LAST THREE MONTHS...	No	Yes	#Times
1. Has anyone threatened you or treated you in a hostile manner?	0	1	()
2. Have you threatened anyone or treated them in a hostile manner?	0	1	___
3. Has someone thrown something at you?	0	1	()
4. Have you thrown something at someone?	0	1	___
5. Has anyone pushed, grabbed or shoved you?	0	1	()
6. Have you pushed, grabbed or shoved anyone?	0	1	___
7. Has anyone slapped you?.....	0	1	()
8. Have you slapped anyone?.....	0	1	___
9. Has anyone kicked, bitten or choked you?.....	0	1	()
10. Have you kicked, bitten, or choked anyone?.....	0	1	___
11. Has anyone hit you with a fist or beaten you up?	0	1	()
12. Have you hit anyone with a fist or beaten up anyone?	0	1	___
13. Has anyone tried to physically force you to have sex against your will?.....	0	1	()
14. Have you tried to physically force anyone to have sex against their will?....	0	1	___
15. Has anyone threatened you with a knife, gun, or any other weapon (e.g., rock, stick).....	0	1	()
16. Have you threatened anyone with a knife, gun, or any other weapon?.....	0	1	___

17. Has anyone fired a gun at you or used a knife or any other weapon
(e.g., rock, stick) on you? 0 1 (____)
18. Have you fired a gun at someone or used a knife or other weapon on
them? 0 1 ____
19. Have you done anything else to someone that might be considered
violent? What?... _____ 0 1 ____

YOU MENTIONED THAT X (*summarize the most serious incidents described earlier, up to 5*)
HAPPENED IN THE PAST THREE MONTHS. NOW I NEED TO GET A LITTLE MORE
INFORMATION ABOUT THAT/THOSE INCIDENTS. **[Interviewer: address one incident at a
time. First, get an open-ended description of the incident, and then ask the probe
questions that weren't addressed in the description. If necessary, remind the
participant that this is confidential. Note that three sheets are available – code no
more than 2 incidents per sheet.]**

20. *LET'S START WITH X. TELL ME ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED.

21. What day did this occur?

22. Where did this happen?

23. Who else was involved? I don't need to know anybody's name, but was it an
acquaintance, friend, family member, or somebody else?

24. Were you injured? (*code the injury at its most serious*)

25. Was anyone that was involved injured? (*record the most serious injury to any co-
participant*)

26. Was there a weapon involved? (*Designed weapon= knife, gun, any other weapon carried
for defense or to inflict injury. Improvised weapon=anything used as a weapon—must be
in hand or on person at the time it is used. Specify what it is.*)

27. Where was the weapon located at the time?

28. WHAT WAS THE PROBLEM THAT LED TO THIS? HOW DID IT ALL START?

29. Were you drinking alcohol just before this happened? Were you using any street drugs
just before this happened?

[Interviewer: use all available information to make the judgments below, and record on the grid]

Was the client's violence:

- *Planned (was there preparation and planning before the violence)?*
- *used to reach some goal (to get money, drugs, etc.)*
- *clearly in self defense (to ward off injury)*
- *clearly unprovoked (not triggered by co-combatant or others, "out of the blue")*

30. *LET'S CONTINUE WITH X. TELL ME ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED.

31. What day did this occur?

32. Where did this happen?

33. Who else was involved? I don't need to know anybody's name, but was it an acquaintance, friend, family member, or somebody else?

34. Were you injured? (*code the injury at its most serious*)

35. Was anyone that was involved injured? (*record the most serious injury to any co-participant*)

36. Was there a weapon involved? (*Designed weapon= knife, gun, any other weapon carried for defense or to inflict injury. Improvised weapon=anything used as a weapon—must be in hand or on person at the time it is used. Specify what it is.*)

37. Where was the weapon located at the time?

38. WHAT WAS THE PROBLEM THAT LED TO THIS? HOW DID IT ALL START?

39. Were you drinking alcohol just before this happened? Were you using any street drugs just before this happened?

[Interviewer: use all available information to make the judgments below, and record on the grid]

Was the client's violence:

- *Planned (was there preparation and planning before the violence)?*
- *used to reach some goal (to get money, drugs, etc.)*
- *clearly in self defense (to ward off injury)*
- *clearly unprovoked (not triggered by co-combatant or others, "out of the blue")*

40. *LET'S CONTINUE WITH X. TELL ME ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED.

41. What day did this occur?

42. Where did this happen?

43. Who else was involved? I don't need to know anybody's name, but was it an acquaintance, friend, family member, or somebody else?

44. Were you injured? (*code the injury at its most serious*)

45. Was anyone that was involved injured? (*record the most serious injury to any co-participant*)

46. Was there a weapon involved? (*Designed weapon= knife, gun, any other weapon carried for defense or to inflict injury. Improvised weapon=anything used as a weapon—must be in hand or on person at the time it is used. Specify what it is.*)

47. Where was the weapon located at the time?

48. WHAT WAS THE PROBLEM THAT LED TO THIS? HOW DID IT ALL START?

49. Were you drinking alcohol just before this happened? Were you using any street drugs just before this happened?

[Interviewer: use all available information to make the judgments below, and record on the grid]

Was the client's violence:

- *Planned (was there preparation and planning before the violence)?*
- *used to reach some goal (to get money, drugs, etc.)*
- *clearly in self defense (to ward off injury)*
- *clearly unprovoked (not triggered by co-combatant or others, "out of the blue")*

IN C. #	CTS #	DATE	LOCATION 1. client home 2. other home 3. store/bank 4. restaurant 5. bar/tavern 6. other commercial 7. work 8. school 9. outdoors 10. outpt. 11. inpt. 12. prison 96. other 99 DK	CO-PART. 1. spouse-cohabitee 2. g.f.-b.f. 3. child, NS* 4. child, S* 5. parental figure 6. other family 7. other known 8. stranger 99. DK	INJURY TO CLIENT 0. none 1. bruises, cuts 2. uncons., int injury, broken bones-teeth 3. stab-gunshot 4. death 96. other 99.DK	INJURY TO CO-PART 0. none 1. bruises, cuts 2. uncons., int injury, broken bones-teeth 3. stab-gunshot 4. death 96. other 99.DK	WEAP. TYPE 1. knife 2. gun 3. other design. 4. improvised-specify 8. N/A 99. DK	WEAP. THREAT 1. in hand 2. in room 3. in bldg. 4. elsewhere 5. will obtain 8. N/A 99. DK	DRINK 0. NO 1. YES 99. DK	DRUG 0. NO 1. YES 99. DK	PUNISH 0. none 1. verbal reprimnd 2. write-up (DR) 3. arrest 4. other specify	JUDGE-MENTS (code all that apply) 1. planned 2. for goal 3. self-defense 4. unprovoked 8. None of above 99. DK
1.	_____	____/____/____ -	_____	____ M/F ____ M/F ____ M/F	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ _____ _____
2.	_____	____/____/____ -	_____	____ M/F ____ M/F ____ M/F	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ _____ _____
3.	_____	____/____/____ -	_____	____ M/F ____ M/F ____ M/F	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ _____ _____
4.	_____	____/____/____ -	_____	____ M/F ____ M/F ____ M/F	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ _____ _____
5.	_____	____/____/____ -	_____	____ M/F ____ M/F ____ M/F	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ _____ _____

APPENDIX II

AGGRESSIVE INCIDENT INTERVIEW

NOW I'D LIKE TO OPEN THIS UP TO LOOK FURTHER THAN JUST THE PAST THREE MONTHS. PLEASE TAKE A MOMENT TO THINK ABOUT THE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEMS (DISPUTES, CONFLICTS) THAT YOU'VE HAD WITH OTHERS DURING YOUR LIFETIME.

I REALIZE THAT CONFLICTS ARE "TWO WAY STREETS." THERE HAVE PROBABLY TIMES IN YOUR LIFE WHEN OTHERS HAVE LAID THEIR HANDS ON YOU OR HURT YOU. HOWEVER, I'D LIKE TO FOCUS NOW ON CONFLICTS WHERE YOU'VE LAID HANDS ON SOMEONE. PLEASE THINK ABOUT THE MOST SERIOUS CONFLICTS LIKE THIS THAT HAVE HAPPENED IN YOUR LIFETIME. AGAIN, TAKE AS MUCH TIME AS YOU NEED. **[When the participant seems ready.]** TELL ME ABOUT THESE INCIDENTS.

[INTERVIEWER: Elicit the three most serious violent incidents that the participant has experienced in his/her lifetime, using the definition provided in the codebook. For each incident, obtain enough information to rate the instrumentality versus reactivity of each. Refer to the original AICS coding sheet and manual for details]

(Start with the most serious incident). Tell me about what happened.

[Interviewers—get as much detail as possible about what happened, from beginning to end. Sample probe questions are listed below]

- When did it happen? Where did it happen? Who else was involved?
- Were you hurt? Was she/he hurt? How?
- What was the problem that led to this? How did it all start?
- How did it end?

Description of Incident 1:

Violence checklist [**check the most serious act in which the subject engaged**]:

- ___ thrown something at someone
- ___ pushed, grabbed, shoved someone
- ___ slapped someone
- ___ kicked, bit or choked someone
- ___ hit or beat up someone
- ___ tried to physically force someone to have sex against their will
- ___ threatened someone with a weapon (designed or improvised) in hand
- ___ fired or used a weapon on someone
- ___ Other/specify:

AICS Ratings

- | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Instrumental vs. Reactive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | |
| 2) Planning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | |
| 3) Goal-directedness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | |
| 4) Provocation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| 5) Arousal | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | |
| 6) Severity of violence | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7) Relationship with victim | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| 8) Intoxication | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | |
| 9) Psychosis | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | |

Description of Incident 2:

Violence checklist [**check the most serious act in which the subject engaged**]:

- ___ thrown something at someone
- ___ pushed, grabbed, shoved someone
- ___ slapped someone
- ___ kicked, bit or choked someone
- ___ hit or beat up someone
- ___ tried to physically force someone to have sex against their will
- ___ threatened someone with a weapon (designed or improvised) in hand

- ___ fired or used a weapon on someone
 ___ Other/specify:

AICS Ratings

1. Instrumental vs. Reactive	1	2	3	4			
2. Planning	1	2	3	4			
3. Goal-directedness	1	2	3	4			
4. Provocation	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5. Arousal	1	2	3	4			
6. Severity of violence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Relationship with victim	1	2	3	4	5		
8. Intoxication	1	2	3	4			
9. Psychosis	1	2	3	4			

Description of Incident 3:

Violence checklist [**check the most serious act in which the subject engaged**]:

- ___ thrown something at someone
 ___ pushed, grabbed, shoved someone
 ___ slapped someone
 ___ kicked, bit or choked someone
 ___ hit or beat up someone
 ___ tried to physically force someone to have sex against their will
 ___ threatened someone with a weapon (designed or improvised) in hand
 ___ fired or used a weapon on someone
 ___ Other/specify:

AICS Ratings

1. Instrumental vs. Reactive	1	2	3	4			
2. Planning	1	2	3	4			
3. Goal-directedness	1	2	3	4			
4. Provocation	1	2	3	4	5	6	

5. Arousal	1	2	3	4			
6. Severity of violence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Relationship with victim	1	2	3	4	5		
8. Intoxication	1	2	3	4			
9. Psychosis	1	2	3	4			

APPENDIX III

AICS RATINGS

Violent Incident Coding Sheet

Instrumental v Reactive/Hostile (code actual event, not just subject's claim)

- 4 – Clearly instrumental aggression (e.g., crime-related incident, drug deal)
- 3 – Primarily instrumental, some reactive qualities
- 2 – Primarily reactive hostile aggression, some instrumental qualities
- 1 – Clearly reactive hostile aggression (e.g., interpersonal conflict)

Planning (include plans for robbery, burglary, etc.)

- 4 – Extensive planning (detailed plan or preparation, rehearsal)
- 3 – Moderate planning (contemplation of action for more than 24 hours)
- 2 – Some planning (action within 24 hours, some plan or preparation)
- 1 – Very little or no planning (acts during argument or fight, no preparation)

Goal-Directness (consider goals like financial gain, not just revenge)

- 4 – Clear, unequivocal goal-directedness (include shooting during crimes)
- 3 – Primary goal-directedness, with presence of other motives
- 2 – Secondary goal-directedness, in presence of other primary motives
- 1 – No apparent goal-directedness (motive to injure victim, retaliate, defend)

Provocation (includes provocation prior to incident, use subject's perception)

- 6 – Exceptionally strong provocation (repeated assault, severe abuse)
- 5 – Very strong provocation (assault)
- 4 – Strong (break-up of a romantic relationship, threat of major life change)
- 3 – Moderate provocation (serious argument or dispute, threat of assault)
- 2 – Mild provocation (insult, minor argument, confrontation with the police)
- 1 – No apparent provocation

Arousal (mental state, primarily code anger, but also consider other affects like fear)

- 4 – Enraged, furious, described as “out of control” or “irrational” or panicked
- 3 – Angry, mad, extremely frightened (can be protracted state)
- 2 – Excited, very nervous, anxious, scared
- 1 – Calm or tense at most

Severity of violence (consider actual harm to victim, not subject's intention)

- 7 – Extreme homicide (multiple victims or multiple fatalities, mutilation)
- 6 – Homicide
- 5 – Severe injury (e.g., lasting impairment or life-threatening injury, some rapes)
- 4 – Serious injury, requiring substantial hospital treatment (e.g., rape, gunshot)
- 3 – Minor injury (e.g., bruises, minor medical treatment, attempted rape)
- 2 – Assault without injury
- 1 – No assault (e.g., threatened with a weapon)

Relationship with victim (if 2 or more victims, code highest)

- 5 – Very close relationship (immediate family member, romantic partner)
- 4 – Close relationship (friend, relative, dating partner, etc.)
- 3 – Specific relationship (teacher, babysitter, etc.)
- 2 – Acquaintance
- 1 – Stranger

Intoxication

- 4 – Severe intoxication (large quantities of alcohol or drugs, very impaired)
- 3 – Intoxicated
- 2 – Mild intoxication (e.g., 1 or 2 drinks)
- 1 – Not intoxicated

Psychosis (reality testing, not mood)

- 4 – Substantial psychotic symptoms (e.g., bizarre or pervasive delusions)
- 3 – Moderate psychotic symptoms (intermittent voices or delusions)
- 2 – Non-psychotic disturbance (e.g., depersonalized)
- 1 – Not psychotic

APPENDIX IV

ENHANCED GOALS FOR VIOLENCE

CODING GUIDE FOR ENHANCED VIOLENCE RATINGS: INSTRUMENTAL VERSUS REACTIVE AGGRESSION AND BEYOND

The primary distinction made in the AICS Coding Guide (Cornell, 1996) is between instrumental and reactive aggression. This distinction is made on the basis of a global rating and characterizes the general motivation for violence.

Instrumental violence typically consists of an identifiable goal, such as money, drugs, power or respect, whereas reactive violence is usually characterized by a hostile reaction to some provocation on the part of the co-participant. Reactive violence is a much more common form of violence, for example, a purely reactive violent incident might include a fight provoked by the actions of a friend or family member. Violent events may also have both instrumental and reactive qualities and are rated on the following dimension in the AICS Coding Guide:

- 4—Clearly instrumental aggression (e.g., crime-related incident, drug deal)
- 3—Primarily instrumental aggression, some reactive qualities
- 2—Primarily reactive hostile aggression, some instrumental qualities
- 1—Clearly reactive hostile aggression (e.g., interpersonal conflict)

Often violent events are not clearly instrumental or clearly reactive. For example, a primarily instrumental violent incident may include a robbery that goes awry, where the victim provokes or angers the aggressor in some way. Similarly, a primarily reactive incident may include instrumental qualities if, after fighting with the co-participant, one of the aggressors decides to steal from the other individual.

Although the distinction between instrumental vs. reactive aggression is useful, this dimension fails to capture the finer variations in an individual's motivation for violence. For example, a person who commits a sadistic violent act with a goal of power clearly differs from someone who commits violence to obtain drugs, however the current AICS rating system does not capture this qualitative difference between individuals.

The ratings included below are intended to enhance the instrumental vs. reactive dimension by clearly specifying the motivation for the violent behavior. These ratings will be made by considering the context of each violent incident, the participants' self-report, a review of available records, and the rater's overall impression of "why" the violence was committed. Half of these ratings should be made after the initial instrumental vs. reactive distinction and half should be made before the initial distinction to avoid potential order effects.

Please think about the primary motivation for each violent incident and make the ratings below. You should consider both the perspective of the participant and your own impression of what happened and why. Please use the supplementary materials along with this manual to make each rating.

Power

How much was the violence motivated by the desire to be powerful or dominate others who are more vulnerable or weaker than the aggressor? Violence characterized by control, domination or humiliation of the victim is likely to include some desire for power on the part of the aggressor. For example, many (though not *all*) sexual assaults are dominating acts that make the aggressor feel powerful. In addition, violence that seems excessive, extreme or sadistic (aggressor enjoys watching the victim experience pain) may be motivated by power.

Please ask yourself the following questions for each incident:

- Was the perpetrator of violence provoked? (if no, then *more* likely power)
- Was the perpetrator of violence acting alone or in a group? (if alone, then *more* likely power)
- Was the perpetrator the leader of the group, was the act his/her idea? (if yes, then *more* likely power)
- Was the perpetrator trying to save face? (if yes, then *less* likely to be power)

Note: Answering these questions is only intended to help with the rating. There are no hard and fast rules.

4—Clearly motivated by power, domination, or desire for control

3—Primarily motivated by power but includes the presence of other goals

2—Primarily motivated by other goals, but violence includes some desire for power

1—Clearly not motivated by power

Respect

How much was the violence motivated by the desire to obtain the respect of others? Violence that takes place in large groups (e.g. in a bar or at the bus stop) or under peer pressure (e.g. gang violence) can be characterized by a desire for respect. For example, an individual who does not want to lose the respect of others around them or who wants to gain the respect of their peers might become violent. Similarly, if the aggressor feels the co-participant was "disrespectful" they may become violent to preserve their "honor".

Gang violence and violence that takes place in large groups are prototypical examples of violence motivated by a desire for respect. In addition, institutional violence is often characterized by a desire for respect. Often violence motivated by a desire for respect is provoked by someone being disrespectful (e.g. a character insult) or is an attempt to “save face” or preserve honor. The violence may take place to gain/take back respect from the co-participant or to gain/preserve the respect of others.

Please ask yourself the following questions for each incident:

- Was the perpetrator of violence provoked? (if yes, then may be respect, but see anger below)
- Was the perpetrator of violence acting alone or in a group? (if in a group, then *more* likely respect)
- Was the perpetrator the leader of the group, was the act his/her idea? (if no, then *more* likely respect)
- Was the perpetrator trying to save face? (if yes, then *more* likely respect)
- Was there a thought process that took place involving disrespect? For example, the subject stated that they felt disrespected (if yes, then *more* likely respect)

Note: Answering these questions is only intended to help with the rating. There are no hard and fast rules.

4—Clearly motivated by the desire for respect

3—Primarily motivated by respect but includes the presence of other goals

2—Primarily motivated by other goals but violence includes some desire for respect

1—Clearly not motivated by respect

Material Gain

How much was the violence motivated by material gain (e.g. drugs, money, cars)? Often violence takes place because someone is trying to obtain something and the victim acts as a “block” or is “in the way” and must be removed to obtain the desired end. For example, an individual might desire money and rob an individual who does not immediately comply, thus “blocking” the person’s desire for money. In addition, people may be used as “tools” to reach some desired end. For example, an individual might hold someone hostage to force other parties to provide money; a material gain for the aggressor.

4—Clearly motivated by the desire for some material gain

3—Primarily motivated by material gain but includes the presence of other goals

2—Primarily motivated by other goals but includes some desire for material gain

1—Clearly not motivated by material gain

Anger

How much was the violence motivated by anger? Typically, violence occurs because of some form of provocation and an emotional response to that provocation. Provocation can be *perceived* or *real*, in other words, the actual perception of the participant is

important to consider. Violence motivated by anger includes revenge and retribution. The major goal of violence motivated by anger is to hurt the victim in *response* to an insult, threat, assault, etc (including threats to loved ones). In the instance of violence purely motivated by anger, the primary reason for becoming violent is *emotional*, there is no desire for any tangible or intangible reward (although hurting someone in response to their actions may be considered a reward or goal, it is qualitatively different from the above ratings, in that it is motivated by emotion). Violence that occurs purely because of an emotion such as anger can involve very little thought process (lashing out) or a “slow cooked,” planned process (lying in wait).

Please ask yourself the following questions for each incident:

- Was the perpetrator of violence provoked? (if yes, then may be anger, but see respect above and fear below)
- Was the perpetrator of violence acting on pure **emotion**? (if yes, then may be anger, but see fear below)
- Was the victim known? (if yes, then more likely anger)
- Was the perpetrator trying to approach or avoid (escape) the other person or negative consequences such as injury? (if approaching, then more likely anger)
- Was there a thought process involving disrespect? (if yes, then less likely anger)

4—Clearly motivated by anger

3—Primarily motivated by anger but includes the presence of other goals

2—Primarily motivated by other goals but includes some anger

1—Clearly not motivated by anger

Fear

How much was the violence motivated by fear? Violence may be motivated by fear if the aggressor is afraid for their lives or the life of someone that they care for. Violence committed to escape harm to the self or to a loved one would be clearly motivated by fear, however it should be clear that the participant was experiencing the emotion of fear. Again, the participants perception is important here, you will be judging how afraid or threatened they felt at the time, the reality of the threat is not important here.

Please ask yourself the following questions for each incident:

- Was the perpetrator trying to approach or avoid (escape) the other person or negative consequences such as injury? (if avoiding, then more likely fear)
- Was the perpetrator of violence provoked? (if yes, then may be fear, but see anger above)
- Was the perpetrator of violence acting on pure **emotion**? (if yes, then may be fear, but see anger above)

4—Clearly motivated by fear

3—Primarily motivated by fear but includes the presence of other goals

2—Primarily motivated by other goals but includes some fear

1—Clearly not motivated by fear

Risky Behavior

How much was the violence motivated by other risky or criminal behavior? Violence may take place alongside other behaviors that lead to a higher risk for violence, such as substance abuse, drug dealing or sensation seeking behavior.

Substance Abuse

Was the participant under the influence of some substance, including alcohol or trying to obtain some substance for personal use? To make the rating below, think about whether substance abuse played an important causal role in the violent incident (e.g., the violence may not have occurred if the individual was in their right state of mind).

- 4 – Clearly motivated by substance abuse
- 3 – Primarily motivated by substance abuse but includes the presence of other goals
- 2 – Primarily motivated by other goals but includes substance abusing behavior
- 1 – Clearly not motivated by substance abuse

Drug Dealing

Was the participant trying to obtain drugs to sell them or run into trouble in the middle of a drug deal? Be certain to differentiate personal drug use from drug dealing. To make the rating below, think about whether dealing drugs played an important causal role in the violent incident (e.g., the individual was dealing drugs to someone that attempted to rob or harm them).

- 4 – Clearly motivated by drug dealing
- 3 – Primarily motivated by drug dealing but includes the presence of other goals
- 2 – Primarily motivated by other goals but includes drug dealing
- 1 – Clearly not motivated by drug dealing

Gang Involvement

Was the participant involved in violence because of their affiliation with a gang? This would include violence between individuals as well as violence that occurs in groups.

- 4 – Clearly motivated by gang involvement
- 3 – Primarily motivated by gang involvement but includes the presence of other goals
- 2 – Primarily motivated by other goals but includes gang involvement
- 1 – Clearly not motivated by gang involvement

Sensation Seeking Behavior

Was the participant involved in violence because of other sensation seeking behaviors? Sensation seeking behaviors are not necessarily illegal, but occur simply for the thrill or novelty. To make the rating below, think about whether or not violence occurred as a

result of some other sensation seeking behavior, or whether the violence itself was committed for the “thrill” of it (e.g., an individual who high-jacks a car by threatening the car owner with a weapon, just to take the car for a joyride).

- 4 – Clearly motivated by sensation seeking
- 3 – Primarily motivated by sensation seeking but includes the presence of other goals
- 2 – Primarily motivated by other goals but includes sensation seeking
- 1 – Clearly not motivated by sensation seeking

Other Risky Behavior

Was the participant involved in violence because of some other risky behavior, not included in the ratings above? Please be sure to indicate what the risky behavior was in the space below.

- 4 – Clearly motivated by other risky behavior
- 3 – Primarily motivated by other risky behavior but includes the presence of other goals
- 2 – Primarily motivated by other goals but includes other risky behavior
- 1 – Clearly not motivated by other risky behavior

What was the other risky behavior associated with this incident? _____

No Apparent or Identifiable Motivation

Does this violent incident appear to have no motivation? If the violent incident doesn't seem to be motivated by any of the factors above, it may be that the violence was committed for reasons that a reasonable person is not able to understand. That is, if the violence doesn't seem to fit correctly anywhere else, it may be that the violence was motivated by something we are not thinking of or something that we didn't capture during the interview or it may have occurred just on a “whim”.

- 4 – Clearly no apparent or identifiable motivation
- 3 – Primarily no apparent motivation but may have the presence of other goals
- 2 – Primarily motivated by other goals but is difficult to understand
- 1 – Clearly has apparent motivation

APPENDIX V

RECORD REVIEW

P & E Collateral Information Schedule For Violence & Manipulation Coding

The type and detail of collateral information available varies across individuals and across settings. Listed below are only general headings; if information is available under a heading, record as much relevant detail as possible. If the information is not available put not applicable.

- 1) Date of interview:
- 2) Does any violent incident involve a gang:
- 3) Number of Aliases:

B. CRIMINAL HISTORY

- 1) Juvenile
 - a) Age at first contact:
 - b) Number of offenses:
 - c) Type of offenses:
 - 1-Violent
 - 2-Potentially violent (e.g., robbery, kidnapping, or crimes that could lead to violence)
 - 3-Other Crimes against person
 - 4-Sex
 - 5-Property
 - 6-Drug
 - 7-Minor
 - d) Specify type of offenses (Circle applicable offenses on crime classification code sheet for juvenile)
 - e) How many behavioral problems in the community:

f) Description of behavioral problems in the community:

2) Adult

a) Age at first contact:

b) Number of **previous** offenses:

c) Type of **previous** offenses:

1-Violent

2-Potentially violent (e.g., robbery, kidnapping, or crimes that could lead to violence)

3-Crimes against person

4-Sex

5-Property

6-Drug

7-Minor

d) Specify type of **previous** offenses (Circle applicable offenses on crime classification code sheet for adult-previous)

e) Number of **current** offenses:

f) Type of **current** offenses:

1-Violent

2-Potentially violent (e.g., robbery, kidnapping, or crimes that could lead to violence)

3-Crimes against person

4-Sex

5-Property

6-Drug

7-Minor

g) Specify type of **current** offenses (Circle applicable offenses on crime classification code sheet for adult-current)

h) Police description of current offense:

i) Code for instrumental violence of police description

Instrumental vs. Reactive	1	2	3	4				
Planning	1	2	3	4				
Goal-directedness	1	2	3	4				
Provocation	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Arousal	1	2	3	4				
Severity of violence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Relationship with victim	1	2	3	4	5			
Toxication	1	2	3	4				
Psychosis	1	2	3	4				

j) Self report of current offense:

k) Does he take responsibility for the crime: yes, no, maybe

l) Number of noncriminal legal problems:

m) Adult type of noncriminal legal problems:

B INSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR

1) Institutional number of behavioral problems:

2) Does he have institutional violence: yes, no, maybe

3) Code for institutional behavior violence:

Instrumental vs. Reactive	1	2	3	4				
Planning	1	2	3	4				
Goal-directedness	1	2	3	4				
Provocation	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Arousal	1	2	3	4				
Severity of violence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Relationship with victim	1	2	3	4	5			
Toxication	1	2	3	4				
Psychosis	1	2	3	4				

4) Institutional program involvement: (Circle all that apply)

- 1- Individual therapy
- 2- Group therapy
- 3- Day program/ Specialized unit
- 4- Substance abuse only program
- 5- Anger management
- 6- Life skills
- 7- Vocational rehabilitation
- 8- School
- 9- Other
- 88- Not applicable

- Please note any additional information regarding treatment attendance and compliance

If applicable please rate program attendance and compliance on the following scale; 1- Never

- 2- Rarely
- 3- Occasionally
- 4- Often

5) Additional comments from institutional staff:

6) Approved institutional family visitors: (Circle all that apply)

- 1- Father
- 2- Mother
- 3- Sister
- 4- Brother
- 5- Wife
- 6- Son
- 7- Daughter
- 8- Grandfather
- 9- Grandmother
- 10- Aunt
- 11- Uncle
- 12- Cousin
- 13- Nephew/ Niece
- 14- Other relative

7) Approved institutional non-family visitors: (Circle all that apply)

- 1- Girlfriend

- 2- Friend (male)
- 3- Friend (female)
- 4- Roommate (male)
- 5- Roommate (female)
- 6- Mental health professional
- 7- Social worker
- 8- Other

C. MANIPULATION HISTORY

Code any non-criminal (e.g., fraud) and non-institutional (e.g., strong-arming other inmates for goods) examples of manipulation here. Criminal and institutional manipulation should be captured above. Here, other manipulation of family, friends, co-workers, and others would be captured.

1) Manipulation #1 ----- Date_____

2) Manipulation #2 ----- Date_____

3) Manipulation #3 ----- Date_____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alterman, A.I., McDermott, P.A., Cacciola, J.S., Rutherford, M.J., Boardman, C.R., McKay, J.R., & Cook, T.G. (1998). A typology of antisociality in methadone patients. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 107*, 412-422.
- American Psychiatric Association (1987). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (Rev. 3rd ed)*. Washington, DC, Author.
- American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.)*. Washington, DC, Author.
- Ammons, R.B., & Ammons, C.H. (1962). The Quick Test (QT): Provisional manual. *Psychological Reports, 11*, 111-161.
- Anderson, C.A., & Bushman, B.J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review Psychology, 53*, 27-51.
- Barbaree, H. E., Seto, M.E., Serin, R.C., Amos, N., & Preston, D.L. (1994). Comparisons between sexual and nonsexual rapist subtypes: Sexual arousal to rape, offense precursors, and offense characteristics. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 21*, 95-114.
- Baron, R., & Kenny, D. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.

- Benning, S.D., Patrick, C.J., Blonigen, D.M., Hicks, B.M., & Iacono, W.G. (2005). Estimating facets of psychopathy from normal personality traits: A step toward community epidemiological investigations. *Assessment, 12*, 3-18.
- Benning, S.D., Patrick, C.J., Hicks, B.M., Blonigen, D.M., & Krugers, R.F. (2003). Factor structure of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Validity and implications for clinical assessment. *Psychological Assessment, 15*, 340-350.
- Berkowitz, L. (1993). *Aggression: Its Causes, Consequences, and Control*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Blackburn, R. (1975). An empirical classification of psychopathic personality. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 127*, 456-460.
- Blackburn, R. (1996). Psychopathy and personality disorder: Implications of interpersonal theory. *Issues in Criminological and Legal Psychology, 24*, 18-23.
- Blackburn, R., & Coid, J. (1999). Empirical clusters of DSM-III personality disorders in violent offenders. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 13*, 18-34.
- Bolt, D. M., Hare, R. D., Vitale, J. E., & Newman, J. P. (2004). A multigroup item response theory analysis of the psychopathy checklist-revised. *Psychological assessment, 16*, 155-168.
- Brinkley, C.A., Newman, J.P., Widiger, T.A., & Lynam, D.R. (2004). Two approaches to parsing the heterogeneity of psychopathy. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 11*, 69-94.
- Buffington-Vollum, J., Edens, J., Johnson, D., & Johnson, J. (2002). Psychopathy as a predictor of institutional misbehavior among sex-offenders: A prospective replication. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 29*, 497-511.

- Bushman, B.J., & Anderson, C.A. (2001). Is it time to pull the plug on the hostile versus instrumental aggression dichotomy? *Psychological Review*, 108, 273-279.
- Buss, A. (1961). *The Psychology of Aggression*. New York: Wiley.
- Cattell, R.B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1, 245-276.
- Cicchetti, D., & Sparrow, S. (1981). Developing criteria for establishing interrater reliability of specific items: Applications to assessment of adaptive behavior. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 86, 127-137.
- Cleckley, H. (1941). *The mask of sanity: An attempt to reinterpret the so-called psychopathic personality*. Oxford, England: Mosby.
- Cleckley, H. (1948). Antisocial personalities. In: L.A. Pennington & I.A. Berg (Eds.) *An Introduction to Clinical Psychology* (pp. 249-264). Oxford England: Ronald Press.
- Cleckley, H. (1976). *The mask of sanity (5th ed.)*. St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Cleckley, H. (1982). *The mask of sanity (6th ed.)*. St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Cooke, D.J., Kosson, D.S., Michie, C. (2001). Psychopathy and ethnicity: Structural, item, and test generalizability of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R) in Caucasian and African American participants. *Psychological Assessment*, 13, 531-542.
- Cooke, D., & Michie, C. (1997). An item response theory analysis of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised. *Psychological Assessment*, 9, 3-14.
- Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (2001). Refining the construct of psychopathy: Towards a hierarchical model. *Psychological Assessment*, 13, 171-188.

- Cooke, D.J., Michie, C., & Hart, S.D. (2006) Facets of clinical psychopathy: Towards clearer measurement. In (Ed.) Christopher Patrick *Handbook of Psychopathic Personality Disorder*. Guilford: New York.
- Cooke, D. J., Michie, C., Hart, S. D. & Clark, D. A. (2004). Reconstructing psychopathy: Clarifying the significance of antisocial and socially deviant behavior in the diagnosis of psychopathic personality disorder. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 18, 337-357.
- Cooke, D.J., Michie, C., & Hart, S. D. Clark, D. (2005a). Assessing Psychopathy in the United Kingdom: Concerns about Cross-cultural Generalisability. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 186, 339-345.
- Cooke, D.J., Michie, C., & Hart, S. D. Clark, D. (2005b). Searching for the Pan-Cultural Core of Psychopathic Personality Disorder: Continental Europe and North America Compared. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 283-295.
- Cooke, D.J., Michie, C., Hart, S.D., & Hare, R.D. (1999). Evaluating the screening version of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL:SV): An item response theory analysis. *Psychological Assessment*, 11, 3-13.
- Cooke, D., Michie, C., & Ryan, J. (2001). *Evaluating Risk for Violence: A Preliminary Study of the HCR-20, PCL-R, and VRAG in a Scottish Prison Sample*. Edinburgh: Scotland Office.
- Cooke, D., Michie, C., & Skeem, J. (in press). Understanding the structure of the Psychopathy Checklist Revised: An exploration of methodological confusion. *British Journal of Psychiatry*.
- Cornell, D.G. (1993). AICS Coding Guide. *Unpublished manuscript*.

- Cornell, D.G. (2003). Psychopathy scores predict adolescent inpatient aggression. *Assessment, 10*, 102-112.
- Cornell, D.G., Benedek, E.P., Benedek, D.M. (1987). Juvenile homicide: Prior adjustment and a proposed typology. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 53*, 383-393.
- Cornell, D.G., Warren, J., Hawk, G., Stafford, E., Oram, G., & Pine, D. (1996). Psychopathy in instrumental and reactive violent offenders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 783-790.
- Craig, R. J., & Olson, R. E. (1988). Relationships between Wechsler Scales and Quick Test IQs among disability applicants. *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice, 19*, 26-30.
- Cota, A.A., Longman, R.S., Holden R.R., & Rekken, G.C. (1993). Comparing different methods for implementing parallel analysis: A practical index of accuracy. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*, 865-875.
- DeCato, C. M., & Husband, S. D. (1984). Quick test and Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – Revised in a prison’s clinical setting. *Psychological Reports, 54*, 939-942.
- DeMatteo, D. & Edens, J. (2006). The role and relevance of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in court: A case law survey of U.S. courts 1991-2004. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 12*, 214-241.
- Dodge, K.A. (1991). The structure and function of reactive and proactive aggression. In D.J. Pepler & K.H. Rubin (Eds.) *The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression* (pp. 201-218). Hillsdale, NH: Erlbaum.

- Douglas, K.S., Strand, S., Belfrage, H., Fransson, G., & Levander, S. (2005). Reliability and validity evaluation of the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version (PCL:YV) in Swedish correctional and forensic psychiatric samples. *Assessment, 12*, 145-161.
- Edens, J. (2006). Unresolved controversies concerning psychopathy: Implications for clinical and forensic decision making. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 37*, 59-65.
- Edens, J.F., Petrila, J., & Buffington-Vollum, J.K. (2001). Psychopathy and the death penalty: Can the psychopathy checklist-revised identify offenders who represent 'a continuing threat to society?' *Journal of Psychiatry & Law, 29*, 433-481.
- Eysenck, H., & Gudjonsson, G. (1989). *The causes and cures of criminality*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Feshbach, S. (1964). The function of aggression and the regulation of aggressive drive. *Psychological Review, 71*, 257-272.
- Feshbach, S. (1970). Aggression. In: P.H. Mussen (Ed.) *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology (Vol. 2)* (pp. 159-259). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fitch, W.L. & Ortega, R.J. (2000). Law and the confinement of psychopaths. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 18*, 663-678.
- Flover, A., Nicholson, D., Hemmati, T., Bernfeld, G., & Quinsey, V. (2002). A comparison of predictors of general and violent recidivism among high-risk federal offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 29*, 235-249.
- Forth, A.E., Hart, S.D., & Hare, R.D. (1990). Assessment of psychopathy in male young offenders. *Psychological Assessment, 2*, 342-344.

- Forth, A. E., Kosson, D. S., & Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version*. Toronto, Ontario, Multi-Health Systems.
- Fowles, D.C. (1980). The three arousal model: Implications of Gray's two-factor learning theory for heart rate, electrodermal activity, and psychopathy. *Psychophysiology*, 17, 87-104.
- Fowles, D., & Missel, K. (1994). Electrodermal hyporeactivity, motivation, and psychopathy: theoretical issues. In D. Fowles, P. Sutker, & S. Goodman (Eds.), *Special Focus on Psychopathy and Antisocial Personality Disorder: a Developmental Perspective* (pp. 263–283). New York: Springer.
- Frick, P.J., Lilienfeld, S.O., Ellis, M., Loney, B., & Silverthorn, P. (1999). The association between anxiety and psychopathy dimensions in children. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 27, 383-392.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C. & Smith, P. (2003). Is the PCL-R really the "unparalleled" measure of offender risk? A lesson in knowledge cumulation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30, 722-724.
- Gray, J. (1987). *The Psychology of Fear and Stress* (2nd Ed.) Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gray, J., & McNaughton, N. (1996). The Neuropsychology of anxiety: reprise. In D. Hope, & C. Izard (Eds.), Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1995: *Perspectives on Anxiety, Panic, and Fear* (pp. 61-134). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Guy, L., Edens, J., Anthony, C., & Douglas, K. (2005). Does psychopathy predict institutional misconduct among adults? A Meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 1056-1064.

- Haapasalo, J. (1994). Types of offense among the Cleckley psychopaths. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 38, 59-67.
- Haapasalo, J., & Pulkkinen, L. (1992). The Psychopathy Checklist and non-violent offender groups. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 2, 315-328.
- Hall, J.R., Benning, S.D., & Patrick, C.J. (2004). Criterion-Related validity of the three-factor model of psychopathy: Personality, behavior, and adaptive functioning. *Assessment*, 11, 4-16.
- Hare, R. D. (1980). A research scale for the assessment of psychopathy in criminal populations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 1, 111-119.
- Hare, R.D. (1981). Psychopathy and violence. In J.R. Hays, T.K. Roberts, & K.S. Solway (Eds.), *Violence and the Violent Individual* (pp. 53-74). New York: Spectrum.
- Hare, R. D. (1991). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist - Revised Manual*. Toronto, Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D. (1996). Psychopathy: A clinical construct whose time has come. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 23, 25-54.
- Hare, R.D. (1998). Psychopathy, affect, and behavior. In D. Cooke, A. Forth, & R.D. Hare (Eds.), *Psychopathy: Theory, Research and Implications for Society* (pp. 105-137). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Hare, R. (1999). Psychopathy as a risk factor for violence. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 70, 181-197.
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R) manual (2nd ed.)*. Toronto, Multi-Health Systems.

- Hare, R.D., Clark, D., Grann, M., & Thornton, D. (2000). Psychopathy and the predictive validity of the PCL-R: An international perspective. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 18, 623-645.
- Hare, R., Harpur, T., Hakstian, R., Forth, A., Hart, S., & Newman, J. (1990). "The Revised Psychopathy Checklist: Reliability and factor structure." *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 2, 338-341.
- Hare, R.D., Hart, S.D., & Harpur, T.J. (1991). Psychopathy and the DSM-IV criteria for Antisocial Personality Disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 100, 391-398.
- Hare, R.D., & Jutai, J.W. (1983). Criminal history of the male psychopath: Some preliminary data. In K.T. Van Dusen & S.A. Mednick (Eds.), *Prospective Studies of Crime and Delinquency* (pp. 225-236). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Hare, R.D., & McPherson, L.M. (1984). Violent and aggressive behavior by criminal psychopaths. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 7, 35-50.
- Hare, R.D., & Neumann, C.S. (2005). Structural models of psychopathy. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, 7, 57-64.
- Harpur, T.J., Hakstian, R., & Hare, R.D. (1988). Factor structure of the Psychopathy Checklist. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 56, 741-747.
- Harpur, T.J., Hare, R.D., & Hakstian, R. (1989). Two-factor conceptualization of psychopathy: Construct validity and assessment implications. *Psychological Assessment*, 1, 6-17.
- Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., & Cormier, C.A. (1991). Psychopathy and violent recidivism. *Law and Human Behavior*, 15, 625-637.

- Hart, S. (1998). Psychopathy and risk for violence. In D.J. Cooke et al (Eds.) *Psychopathy: Theory, Research, and Implications for Society* (pp 355-373). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hart, S. (2001). Forensic issues. In: J.W. Livesley (Ed.) *Handbook of Personality Disorders: Theory, Treatment, and Research* (pp. 555-569). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hart, S., Cox, D., & Hare, R. (1995). *Manual for the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version (PCL:SV)*. Toronto, Canada, Multi-Health Systems.
- Hart, S. & Dempster, R. (1997). Impulsivity and psychopathy. In C. Webster, & M. Jackson (Eds.), *Impulsivity: Theory, Assessment, and Treatment* (pp. 212-232). New York: Guilford.
- Hartup, W.W. (1974). Aggression in childhood: Developmental perspectives. *American Psychologist*, 29, 336-341.
- Heilbrun, K., Hart, S.D., Hare, R.D., Gustafson, D., Nunez, C. & White, A.J. (1998). Inpatient and post-discharge aggression in mentally disordered offenders: The role of psychopathy. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13, 514-527.
- Hemphill, J.F. (1992). Recidivism of criminal psychopaths after therapeutic community treatment. Unpublished masters thesis. University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada.
- Hemphill, J.F., & Hare, R.D. (2004). Some misconceptions about the Hare PCL-R and risk assessment: A Reply to Gendreau, Goggin, and Smith. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31, 203-243.

- Hemphill, J. F., Hare, R. D. & Wong, S. (1998). Psychopathy and recidivism: A review. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 3, 139-170.
- Herpertz, S.C., & Sass, H. (2000). Emotional deficiency and psychopathy. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 18, 567-580.
- Hicks, B.M., Markon, K.E., Patrick, C.J., Krueger, R., & Newman, J.P. (2004). Identifying psychopathy subtypes on the basis of personality structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 16, 276-288.
- Hicks, M., Rogers, R., & Cashel, M. (2000). Predictions of violent and total infractions among institutionalized male juvenile offenders. *Journal of American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 28, 182-190.
- Hill, C.D., Neumann, C.S., & Rogers, R. (2004). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version in offenders with Axis I disorders. *Psychological Assessment*, 16, 90-95.
- Holland, T.R., Beckett, G.E., & Levi, M. (1981). Intelligence, personality, and criminal violence: A multivariate analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 49, 106-111.
- Horn, J.L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 30, 179-185.
- Jackson, R.L., Rogers, R., Neumann, C.S., & Lambert, P.L. (2002). Psychopathy in female offenders: An investigation of its underlying dimensions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 692-704.
- Johns, J. (1997). *The Basic Reading Inventory* (7th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

- Karpman, B. (1941). On the need of separating psychopathy into two distinct clinical types: The symptomatic and the idiopathic. *Journal of Criminal Psychopathology*, 3, 112-137.
- Karpman, B. (1946). Psychopathy in the scheme of human typology. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 103, 276-288.
- Karpman, B. (1948a). The myth of the psychopathic personality. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 104, 523-534.
- Karpman, B. (1948b). Conscience in the psychopath: Another version. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 18, 455-491.
- Kosson, D, Smith, S., & Newman, J. (1990). Evaluating the construct validity of psychopathy in Black and White male inmates: Three preliminary studies. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 99, 250-259.
- Kroner, D., & Loza, W. (2001). Evidence for the efficacy of self-report in predicting nonviolence and violent criminal recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 168-177.
- Lidz, C.W., Mulvey, E.P., & Gardner, W. (1993). The accuracy of predictions of violence to others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 151-158.
- Lilienfeld, S. (1994). Conceptual problems in the assessment of psychopathy. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 14, 17-38.
- Lilienfeld, S. (1998). Methodological advances and developments in the assessment of psychopathy. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 36, 99-125.

- Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in noncriminal populations. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 66, 488-524.
- Lilienfeld, S.O., & Widows, M.R. (in press). *Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised (PPI-R) Professional Manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Lykken, D.T. (1995). *The Antisocial Personalities*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lyon, D.R., & Ogloff, J.R. (2000). Legal and ethical issues in psychopathy assessment. In: C.B. Gacono (Ed.) *The Clinical and Forensic Assessment of Psychopathy: A Practitioners Guide* (pp. 139-173). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McCord, W., & McCord, J. (1964). *The Psychopath: An Essay on the Criminal Mind*. Princeton, New Jersey, Vam Nostrand.
- Miethe, T., & McCorkle, R. (2001). *Crime profiles: The anatomy of dangerous persons, places and situations*, 2nd Edition. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Millon, T. (1981). *Disorders of Personality: DSM-III, Axis II*. New York: Wiley.
- Monahan J., Appelbaum P.S., Mulvey E.P., Robbins P.C., Lidz C.W. (1993). Ethical and legal duties in conducting research on violence: lessons from the MacArthur Risk Assessment Study. *Violence and Victimization*, 8, 387-96
- Monahan, J., Steadman, H., Silver, E., Appelbaum, P., Robbins, P., Mulvey, E., Roth, L., Grisso, T., & Banks, S. (2001). *Rethinking violence risk assessment: Mental disorder and the law*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morey, L. (1991). *Personality Assessment Inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

- Murrie, D.C., Cornell, D.G., Kaplan, S., McConville, D., & Levy-Elkon, A. (2004). Psychopathy scores and violence among juvenile offenders: A multi-measure study. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 22, 49-67.
- Newman, J. P. (1998). Psychopathic behavior: An information processing perspective. In D. J. Cooke, R. D. Hare, & A. Forth (Eds.), *Psychopathy: Theory, Research and Implications for Society*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, (pp. 81-104).
- Newman, J.P., & Brinkley, C.A. (1997). Reconsidering the low-fear explanation for primary psychopathy. *Psychological Inquiry*, 8, 236-260.
- Newman, J.P., MacCoon, D.G., Vaughn, L.J., & Sadeh, N. (2005). Validating a distinction between primary and secondary psychopathy with measures of Gray's BIS and BAS constructs. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 114, 319-323.
- Newman, J. P., Patterson, C. M., Howland, E. W. & Nichols, S. L. (1990). Passive avoidance in psychopaths: The effects of reward. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 1101-1114.
- Newman, J.P., & Schmitt, J.P. (1998). Passive avoidance in psychopathic offenders: A replication and extension. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 107, 527-532.
- Newman, J.P., Schmitt, J.P., & Voss, W. (1997). The impact of motivational neutral cues on psychopaths: Assessing the generality of the response modulation hypothesis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106, 563-575.
- Newman, J.P., Wallace, J.F., Schmitt, W.A., & Arnett, P.A. (1997). Behavioral inhibition system functioning in anxious, impulsive and psychopathic individuals. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 23, 583-592.

- Ochberg, F., Brantley, A., Hare, R., Houk, P., Iannal, R., James, R., O'Toole, M., & Sathoff, G. (2003). Lethal predators: Psychopathic, sadistic, and sane. *International Journal of Emergency Mental Health*, 5, 121-136.
- Pardini, D.A., Lochman, J.E., & Frick, P.J. (2003). Callous/unemotional traits and social-cognitive processes in adjudicated youths. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 42, 364-371.
- Parkerson, G., Broadhead, E., & Tse, C. (1993). The Duke Severity of Illness Checklist (DUSOI) for measurement of severity and co-morbidity. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 46, 379-393.
- Patrick, C.J. (1993). Emotion in the criminal psychopath: Startle reflex modulation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 102, 82-92.
- Patrick, C. J. (1994). Emotion and psychopathy: Startling new insights. *Psychophysiology*, 31, 319-330.
- Patrick, C.J. (1995). Emotion and temperament in psychopathy. *Clinical Science*, Fall, 58.
- Patrick, C.J. (2006). *Handbook of Psychopathy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Patrick, C., Bradley, M. M. & Lang, P. J. (1993). Emotion in the criminal psychopath: Startle reflex modulation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 102, 82-92.
- Patrick, C., Zempolich, K., & Levenston, G. (1997). Emotionality and violent behavior in psychopaths: A biosocial analysis. In: A. Raine, P. Brennan, D. Farrington, & S. Mednick (Eds.): *Biosocial bases of violence* (pp. 145-161). New York: Plenum Press.
- Patrick, C.J., & Zempolich, K.A. (1998). Emotion and aggression in the psychopathic personality. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 3, 303-338.

- Porter, S. (1996). Without conscience or without active conscience? The etiology of psychopathy revisited. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 1*, 179-189.
- Porter, S., Woodworth, M., Earle, J., Drugge, J., & Boer, D. (2003). Characteristics of sexual homicides committed by psychopathic and nonpsychopathic offenders. *Law and Human Behavior, 27*, 459-470.
- Poythress, N.G., Edens, J.F., & Lilienfeld, S.O. (1998). Criterion-related validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory in a prison sample. *Psychological Assessment, 10*, 426-430.
- Poythress, N., & Skeem, J.L. (2006). Disaggregating psychopathy: Where and how to look for variants. In C. Patrick (Ed.) *Handbook of Psychopathy* (pp. 172-192). New York: Guilford Press.
- Price, J.M., & Dodge, K.A. (1991). Reactive and proactive aggression in childhood: Relations to peer status and social context dimensions. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 17*, 455-471.
- Pulkinnen, L. (1987). Offensive and defensive aggression in humans: A longitudinal perspective. *Aggressive Behavior, 13*, 197-212.
- Rice, M.E., Harris, G.T., & Quinsey, V.L. (1990). A follow-up of rapists assessed in a maximum-security psychiatric facility. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5*, 435-448.
- Ridenour, T., Marchant, G., & Dean, R. (2001). Is the revised Psychopathy Checklist useful for adolescents? *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 19*, 227-238.
- Rogers, R. (1995). Psychopathy Checklist (PCL). In: R. Rogers (Ed.) *Diagnostic and Structured Interviewing: A Handbook for Psychologists* (pp. 229-243). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

- Rogers, R., & Dion, K. (1991). Rethinking the DSM-III-R diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law*, 19, 21-31.
- Rutherford, M., Alterman, A., Cacciola, J., & McKay, J. (1997). Validity of the Psychopathy Checklist Revised in male methadone patients. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 44, 143-149.
- Salekin, R.T., Brannen, D.N., Zalot, A.A., Leistico, A., & Neumann, C.S. (in press). Factor structure of psychopathy in youth: Testing the applicability of the new four-factor model. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*.
- Salekin, R., Rogers, R., Sewell, K. (1996). A review and meta-analysis of the Psychopathy Checklist and Psychopathy Checklist-Revised: Predictive validity of dangerousness. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 3, 203-215
- Schmitt, W.A., & Newman, J.P. (1999). Are all psychopathic individuals low anxious? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 108, 353-358.
- Schubert, C.A., Mulvey, E.P., Lidz, C.W., Gardner, W.P., & Skeem, J.L. (2005). Weekly community interviews with high-risk participants: Operational issues. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 632-646.
- Serin, R.C. (1991). Psychopathy and violence in criminal psychopaths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 6, 423-431.
- Serin, R. C. (1996). Violent recidivism in criminal psychopaths. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20, 207-217.
- Serin, R.C., & Amos, N.L. (1995). The role of psychopathy in the assessment of dangerousness. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 18, 231-238.

Skeem, J.L., & Cooke, D. (in press). Is antisocial behavior essential to psychopathy?

Conceptual directions for resolving the debate. *Psychological Assessment*.

Skeem, J.L., Edens, J.F., Camp, J., & Colwell, L.H. (2004). Are there ethnic differences in levels of psychopathy? A meta-analysis. *Law and Human Behavior*, 28, 505- 527.

Skeem, J., Johansson, P., Andershed, H., Kerr, M., & Eno Louden, J. (in press). Two subtypes of psychopathic violent offenders that parallel primary and secondary variants. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*.

Skeem, J.L., Miller, J.D., Mulvey, E., Tiemann, J. & Monahan, J. (2005). Using a five-factor lens to explore the relation between personality traits and violence in psychiatric Patients. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 454-465.

Skeem, J.L., & Mulvey, E.P. (2001). Psychopathy and community violence among civil psychiatric patients: Results from the MacArthur Violence Risk Assessment Study. *Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology*, 69, 358-374.

Skeem, J. L., Mulvey, E. P., & Grisso, T. (2003). Applicability of traditional and revised models of psychopathy to the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version. *Psychological Assessment*, 15, 41-55.

Skeem, J.L., Poythress, N., Edens, J.F., Lilienfeld, S.O., Cale, E.M. (2003). Psychopathic personality or personalities? Exploring potential variants of psychopathy and their implications for risk assessment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 8, 513-546.

Strauss, M., & Gelles, R. (1990). *Physical Violence in American Families*. Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

- Tellegen, A. (1985). Structures of mood and personality and their relevance to assessing anxiety, with an emphasis on self-report. In: A.H. Tuma and J.D. Maser (Eds.) *Anxiety and the Anxiety Disorders* (pp. 681-706). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tellegen, A., & Waller, N. (1994). Exploring personality through test construction: Development of the multidimensional personality questionnaire. In: S.R. Briggs, & J.M. Cheek (Eds.) *Personality Measures: Development and Evaluation* (pp. 133-161). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Tolman, A., & Mullendore, K. (2003). Risk evaluations of the courts: Is service quality a function of specialization? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 34, 225-232.
- Traub, G. S., & Spruill, J. (1982). Correlations between the Quick Test and Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised. *Psychological Reports*, 51, 309-310.
- Velicer, W.F. (1976). Determining the number of components from the matrix of partial correlations. *Psychometrika*, 41, 321-327.
- Verona, E., Patrick, C. J. & Joiner, T. E. (2001). Psychopathy, antisocial personality, and suicide risk. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 110, 462-470.
- Vitacco, M. J., Neumann, C. S., & Jackson, R. L. (2005). Testing a four-factor model of psychopathy and its association with ethnicity, gender, intelligence, and violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 466-476.
- Vitacco, M.J., Rogers, R., Neumann, C.S., Harrison, K.S., & Vincent, G. (2005). A comparison of factor models on the PCL-R with mentally disordered offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32, 526-545.

- Walsh, T., & Walsh, Z. (2006). The evidentiary introduction of Psychopathy Checklist-Revised assessed psychopathy in U.S. courts: Extent and appropriateness. *Law and Human Behavior, 30*, 493-507.
- Walters, G.D. (2003). Predicting institutional adjustment and recidivism with the Psychopathy Checklist factor scores: A meta-analysis. *Law and Human Behavior, 27*, 541-558.
- Walters, G., Duncan, S., & Geyer, M. (2003). Predicting disciplinary adjustment in inmates undergoing forensic evaluation: A direct comparison of the PCL-R and the PAI. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology, 14*, 382-393.
- Warren, J. I., Burnette, M. L., South, S. C., Chauhan, P., Bale, R. & Friend, R., & Van Patten, I. (2003). Psychopathy in women: Structural modeling and comorbidity. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 26*, 223-242.
- Webster, C., Douglas, K., Eaves, D., & Hart, S. (1997). Assessing risk of violence to others. In C.D. Webster & M.A. Jackson (Eds.), *Impulsivity: Theory, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 251-277). New York: Guilford Press.
- Woodworth, M., & Porter, S. (2002). In cold blood: Characteristics of criminal homicides as a function of psychopathy. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 111*, 436-445.
- Widiger, T.A., Cadoret, R., Hare, R.D., Robins, L., Rutherford, M., Zanarini, M., Alterman, A., Apple, M., Corbitt, E., Forth, A., Hart, S., Kultermann, J., Woody, G., & Frances, A. (1996). DSM-IV Antisocial Personality Disorder field trial. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 105*, 3-16.
- Williams, F., & McShane, M. (1999). *Criminological Theory*, 3rd Edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Williamson, S., Hare, R., & Wong, W. (1987). Violence: Criminal psychopaths and their victims. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 19, 454-462.
- Williamson, S.E., Harpur, T.J., & Hare, R.D. (1991). Abnormal processing of affective words by psychopaths. *Psychophysiology*, 28, 260-273.
- Wulach, J. (1983). Diagnosing the DSM-III antisocial personality disorder. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 14, 330-340.
- Zwick, W.R. & Velicer, W.F. (1986). Comparison of five rules for determining the number of components to retain. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 432-442.

VITA

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Jacqueline Patricia Camp

Home Address:

7904 Blue Charm Ave.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89149

Degrees:

Bachelor of Arts, Psychology, 2004
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Special Honors and Awards:

Summer 2006, GREAT Scholarship

Publications:

Skeem, J., Eno Loudon, J., Polaschek, D., & Camp, J. (in press). Assessing relationship quality in mandated community treatment: Blending care with control. *Psychological Assessment*.

Skeem, J., Edens, J., Camp, J., & Colwell, H. (2004). Do racial groups differ in levels of psychopathy? A meta-analysis. *Law & Human Behavior*, 28, 505-527.

Eno Loudon, J., Skeem, J., Camp, J., & Christensen, E. Supervising probationers with mental disorders: What do agencies do? *Manuscript Under Review: Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*.

Thesis Title: Understanding Psychopathy and Violence: The Role of Motivation

Thesis Examination Committee:

Co-Chairperson, Dr. Kim Barchard, Ph.D.

Co-Chairperson, Dr. Jennifer Skeem, Ph.D.

Committee Member, Dr. Douglas Ferraro, Ph.D.

Committee Member, Dr. Karen Kemtes, Ph.D.

Graduate Faculty Representative, Dr. Joel Lieberman, Ph.D.